

The Classical Review

APRIL 1888.

ON THE FISH 'Ορφός.

DURING the excavations carried on for three years at Assos by the American Archaeological Institute, we devoted as much attention to the Flora and Fauna of the Troad as was consistent with those researches concerning the monuments of the ancient town which formed the more direct object of the undertaking. Assos lies upon the Gulf of Adramyttion,—than which no part of the Eastern Aegean contains a greater variety of fish. So richly is it provided in this respect, that fishing craft to-day come to it even from distant Bari and Malta.

The methods of native fishermen offer in many ways an interesting commentary on the Halieutics of Oppian, of Pankrates, and of Ovid;¹ and not only can we recognize in the means employed for the capture of the fish,—such as the spurge poisoning, and the spearing by torchlight,—those in use among the ancients, but we can trace in the Romaic usage the classic origin of almost all the names by which the varieties are designated. Researches made upon this coast by a scholar as learned in the present state of science as was Belon in the sixteenth century, or Sibthorp a hundred years ago, could not fail to throw much light upon the Ichthyology of the Ancients. I would give a single instance of the indications thus to be derived.

A fish of great size, caught not far from the mole of Assos in the summer of 1882, permits the correct identification of a name, frequently employed by classic authors, which has been wrongly defined in all dictionaries hitherto published. The body of this fish was of elongated oval shape, somewhat compressed, the head thick, the

lower jaw protruding. In colour it was of a dull purple brown, mottled, with a silver-white belly. The fin membranes were reddish brown, and, like the tail, tipped with white. The dorsal was single, the scales very small. The specimen caught at Assos weighed not less than thirty-four kilograms (seventy-five pounds).¹ Its flesh proved to be white, tender, and extremely palatable. Of decisive importance in the identification was the presence of those ridged and spined processes of the head and gills which have given to the French *Cernier*² its Latinized name *Polyprion Cernium*. The fish thus agrees in all distinctive characteristics with Cuvier's (*Histoire Naturelle des Poissons*, vol. iii. Paris, 1829. Pl. 42, chap. xvi.) description of the stone bass, or, as it is sometimes called in England, the wreck-fish.

Among the Greek fishermen of the Gulf of Adramyttion this fish is known as Ποφός or 'Ορφός,—the very name used by Aristotle, who, while living at Assos as the guest of his kinsman Hermeias, had opportunity to study the habits of the stone bass upon this very coast. He speaks of it as frequenting the shore (*Hist. Animal*, viii. 13, 1),—as growing quickly from a small to a large size (*Ibid.* v. 10, 5),—as living entirely upon flesh (*Ibid.* viii. 2, 4), and as concealing itself during winter (*Ibid.* viii. 15, 1). Elsewhere (in *Athenaios*, vii. 97) he refers

¹ It was sold for one medjid and a quarter (about four shillings). The orphos would certainly have fetched much more in antiquity, when even so small a fish as the tench sold for four drachmes (Menander, *Ephes.* in *Athenaios*, vii. 83), and, if we may believe the testimony of Archestratos (*Athenaios*, vii. 44), 'the very smallest and cheapest galaos cost not less than one thousand Attic drachmes.'

² Strange to say, this word is neither in the Dictionary of the French Academy nor in that of Landais, nor in that of Littré. It is to be found, however, in Bescherelle, *Dictionnaire National*, and in any good French dictionary of natural history, as for instance that of Orbigny, vol. iii. The variety in question is known as the *Cernier Brun*.

¹ Tchihatchef (*Asie Mineure*, Paris, 1853-69) remarks with great truth: 'Les opérations des pêcheurs de l'Anatolie sont encore au point où elles se trouvaient il y a plus de seize siècles (du temps d'Aélien).' Unfortunately the work of the great Russian naturalist and explorer does little more than record a few disconnected observations in this regard.

to its sharp and jagged teeth. Of particular interest is the adjective *πεπερηγής* applied to the orphos by Noumenios (in Athenaios, vii. 97), this being eminently characteristic of the rough projections of the head before mentioned. Its flesh was esteemed a delicacy, and was frequently recommended as a food for invalids by the Greek physicians. Alexander of Tralles, to name but one author, recommends it no less than ten times during the course of his work (Ed. Puschmann, vol. ii. pp. 27, 169, 251, 303, 311, 367, 403, 421, 495, and 509). It is not the present purpose to discuss the sacred and oracular character attributed to this fish by the ancients, or the fables concerning its marvellous tenacity of life. The passages quoted will suffice for identification.

The ancient name has been retained in widely distant parts of the eastern Mediterranean, it figuring as *Ῥόφος* in a list of fishes furnished to Sibthorp (*Remarks relating to the Natural History of Parts of European Turkey*; in Walpole, *Travels in various Countries of the East; being a continuation of Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey*. London, 1820) by the caloyers of Mount Athos, nearly a century ago, and among the fishes of Zante, referred to by the same naturalist (ibid., *Fishes of Zante*), the *Ῥοφός* is mentioned. The modern vernacular thus still retains the irregular accent remarked upon by Athenaios (vii. 97). The young of the fish are to-day called *ὀρφύ* or *ὀρφάκι*, from the ancient diminutives *ὀρφίος* (Alexander of Tralles, ed. Puschmann, vol. ii. p. 495) or *ὀρφίσκος* (Pankrates, *Hal.* in Athenaios, vii. 71), and *ὀρφακίτης* (Dorion, in Athenaios, vii. 97).

It is thus evident, both from the similarity of the ancient and modern names, and from the general agreement of the descriptions, that the *ὀρφός* or *ὀρφῶς* (Latin, *Orphus*) is the stone bass. This definition, however, is not given in any Greek or Latin dictionary with which the writer is acquainted. Some of the best and most complete of these—as, for instance, the *Thesaurus* of Estienne and the Greek-German dictionary of Pape—give no generic name whatever. In the seventh edition of Liddell and Scott (1883) the word is explained to mean ‘a kind of sea-perch’; the third edition of Dunbar (1850) says ‘perhaps an anchovy or sprat,’ and in the zoological appendix to the same volume, by Adams, the orphos is called a *loach*. In Riddle’s translation of Scheller’s Lexicon, in Lewis and Short, and in White and Riddle, the fish is declared to be the *gilt-head*, while Smith supposes it to be the *serranus*

anthias of Cuvier. Nor are the definitions of the classical dictionaries in foreign languages more correct. Georges calls the fish, probably from the similarity of the name, *der Orf*, i.e., the *nerfing* (*leuciscus idus*), a river fish, similar to the finscale or rudd, and answering in no particular to the accounts of the orphos given by the ancients.

It is more surprising that the naturalists who have described the orphos should be equally in error. Sibthorp, in the publication before referred to, gives to both the fishes of Athos and Zante the name *sparus orfus*, although they differ entirely from all the sea-brems; while Bory de St. Vincent (*Relation du Voyage de la Commission Scientifique de Morée dans le Peloponnèse, les Cyclades et l’Attique*. Paris, 1836–38; and especially the ichthyological contributions of the same writer to the *Expédition Scientifique de Morée*. Paris, 1831, etc.) supposes the orphos to be *le mérrou* (probably the *serranus gigas* of Cuvier), a fish but about half as large as the stone bass. Cuvier himself (note to Pliny, ix. 24, ed. Lemaire), from a partial acquaintance with the descriptions of the orphos given by ancient authors, identifies it with *le barbier* (*anthias sacer*, Bloch); and Bourquin, in his recent translation of Oppian (*Les Halieutiques, par Oppien de Cilicie, les Cynegetiques, par Oppien de Syrie*. Coulommiers, 1877, p. 10) states the orphos to be an ‘*acanthopterygien sparroïde*.’ The English translator of Oppian (John Jones, Oxford, 1722) ingeniously avoided the difficulty by inventing a new English word: *oerve*. It is unnecessary to refer to the vague surmises of the older travellers in the Levant, who, since the middle of the sixteenth century,¹ have frequently made mention of the fish, remarkable as one of the largest taken in these waters. The list of errors is sufficiently extended. Including, as it does, so many river fishes, and such diminutive members of the finny tribe, it bespeaks but slight attention to the characteristic statements of the

¹ The first travellers who described this fish seem to have been Belon (Pierre): *Les Observations de Plusieurs Singularités et choses Mémorables Trouvées en Grèce, Asie, Judée, Egypte, Arabie et Autres Pays*, etc.: Paris, 1554; and Gilles (Pierre), *De Bosporo Thracio*, Lugduni, 1561. On the other hand, the *cernium polyprion* does not appear in the lists of fishes of the Mediterranean given by William Henry Smyth: (*The Mediterranean: a Memoir, Physical, Historical, and Nautical*: London, 1854), L. Rigler (*Die Türkei und ihre Bewohner*: Wien, 1852), and Tchihatcheff (*Asie Mineure, seconde partie*). The first-named of these writers was aware of the existence of the stone bass in the Mediterranean, but errs in assigning to it the name *sciaena aquila*.

classic authors,¹ and to the striking peculiarities of a fish still known throughout the coasts of the Aegean by its ancient name.

While modern writers, without exception, are thus at fault, the last scholar of Greek Byzantion and first humanist of the Renaissance has fortunately given a translation of the name which of itself would almost suffice to prove the correctness of the present identification. In the Latin text of Aristotle's *Natural History*, published in 1476 by the *doctissimus* Theodoros Gaza, ὀρφός is rendered by the word *cernua*. Gaza, born (A.D. 1398) upon the eastern coast of the Aegean, must have been well acquainted

¹ A remarkably complete collection of the references made by the ancient authors to the *orophos* was published, more than three centuries ago, by Rondeletius (Gulielmus): *Libri de Piscibus Marinis*: Lugduni, 1554-55, lib. v. 25. His description alone should have sufficed to preserve the lexicographers from their manifold errors.

with the orophos, and aware of its identity with the stone bass, which in Italy he heard called *cernio*. Unwilling to employ in his version the classic Latin name *orophus*, which could convey no conception to his Roman readers of the Quattrocento, he coined a new Latin name, *cernua*, analogous to the Italian. A parallel case is that of the English-speaking inhabitants of the Azores, where the fish abounds. In default of any word in our language of similar sound to the Romanic appellations, they have invented for the stone bass the name *cherne*. The suggestive term employed by Gaza was, however, expunged from the Latin text of Aristotle by subsequent editors, and since the loss of this clue there has reigned for more than four centuries an entire ignorance in regard to the true nature of the *orophos*.

JOSEPH THACHER CLARKE.

NOTES ON THE HOMERIC GENITIVE.

(Continued from page 13.)

III.

THERE seems to have been a general idea, both in ancient and modern times, that 'the o of the genitive in -οιο, -εο, -αο, is not elided.' (Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, § 376.) No more it is in our MSS., but no more are a good many other things which Mr. Monro, like everybody else, welcomes with open arms. It so happens however that one instance of this elision is found in the MSS., not of Homer indeed, but of Pindar. In *Pyth.* xii. 24 all the MSS. read (*testibus* Boeckh, Tycho Mommsen, and Weise) Φόρκοι' ἀμαύρωσεν γένος. Boeckh altered it to Φόρκοιο μαύρωσεν γένος, wherein he is followed by Donaldson and Gildersleeve. But Mr. Fennell adopts the version of the MSS., καλῶς γε ποιών, and also in *Olymp.* xiii. 48, *Nem.* ix. 131, *Isth.* i. 21 he reads Θεσσαλοῖ' ἐπ', σκοποῖ' ἀγχιστα, Ἰολαοῖ' ἐναρμόξαι. And in *Olymp.* vii. 2 the ordinary reading, followed by Mr. Fennell among others, is ἔνδον ἀμπέλων in defiance of the metre, where ἀμπέλοι' ἔνδον ought to be restored as Weise suggests, though in his text he has ἀμπέλων ἔνδον, Heyne's reading. Boeckh on this line quotes many instances of similar hiatus, but adds: 'Inter hostamen locos istius modi sunt plurimi in quibus

hiatum mitiget digamma . . . Nullam excusationem habet,' *Ol.* iii. 32, xiii. 34, *Nem.* ix. 55, σκοποῖ' ἀγχιστα.' As *Olymp.* iii. 32 and xiii. 34 are Ὀρθωσίᾳ ἔγραψεν and Θεσσαλοῖ' ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ, it appears that two out of the only three inexcusable hiatuses in Pindar (according to Boeckh) are instances of this genitive in -ον, and, considering this together with the MSS. reading in *Pyth.* xii. 24, and the equally inexcusable hiatus in *Isth.* i. 21 (which Boeckh omits), we are forced to believe that Pindar did elide the o of the genitive in -οιο.

Bergk also may be added to the supporters of this view as far as concerns the elegiac and lyric poets. In the fragment of the hymn of Lasus to Demeter he reads Κλυμένοι' ἄλοχον, in Simonides 85 καὶ βιότοιοι' ἐλίγος, in Archilochus 77 ὡς Διωνύσοι' ἄνακτος. (I quote from his *Anthologia Lyrica*, editio tertia, ex *Poetarum Lyricorum Graecorum*, editione quarta expressa. Leipsic, Teubner, 1883.) But he does not read it everywhere that he finds a genitive in -ον long before a vowel, as he reads ἀμπέλου ὁ δὲ μῦθος in Simonides 75, θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο in Simonides 99; cf. Theognis 253, 440, 957. And I fully agree with him in thinking that this elision should not be restored everywhere, though perhaps it will never be possible

to decide exactly where to restore it and where not.

Thirdly, though there is no trace of this elision in our texts, the Scholiast A on A. 35, as Mr. Leaf informs me, has preserved an old variant λευκοί for λευκοί, which, on the principle of the more difficult being the more likely reading, is almost certainly right.

Another case of such elision is preserved in a monument less open to doubt than any MS. can be. In the third sepulchral inscription of Kaibel's *Epigrammata Graeca ex Lapidibus collecta* (Berlin, 1878) ὁδοῖ is found, and has of course been 'corrected.' The epigram is as follows in Kaibel's text:

Ἀρχέμενος τόδε σῆμα nomen defuncti]
ἔσται· ἐγὼς ὁδοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ [σώφρονος ἀνδρός].
Supplevit Kirchhoff.—2. ΔΟΙ corr. Kiessling hastam pro interpunctionis nota habens (:)'. It is perfectly evident from a glance at Kirchhoff's facsimile of the inscription (C. I. A. 465) that the 'hasta' was meant for an I and not for an 'interpunctionis nota.' But Kirchhoff transliterates it as ἐγὼς ὁδοῦ, which it is hard indeed to accept, as this inscription dates from the sixth century, and ἐγὼς is not found with a dative before Euripides. (It is true that Homer has been accused of using this construction (A. 340), but it is a monstrous perversion of a plain passage where οἱ is merely the ethical dative.) To read ὁδοῖ in our inscription is such a simple way out of the difficulty that it has escaped the too far-sighted eyes of the editors.

Now what are we to say to all this? We find Pindar certainly, and probably other lyric poets, eliding the genitive in -οιο, we find a case of it even in an inscription, we find a variant supporting it in one passage of Homer himself, and we shall soon find that the use of it will save us from certain difficulties in the *Iliad*. Is it possible to deny that Homer elided it also? Take a parallel case. Bentley knew that the lyric poets used the digamma, he found that it was of inestimable value for the scansion of Homer, and he introduced it freely. To compare small things with great, the elision of -οιο and the use of the digamma are exactly on the same footing.

If that is once granted, there can be no difficulty about the other genitives in -αο and -εο. For that in -αο I have a stronger proof than any yet brought forward. The form Ἀτρεΐδαο occurs in our texts of Homer twenty-seven times and the form Ἀτρεΐδω seven. Every one of the latter is before a vowel. Is it not plain therefore that for Ἀτρεΐδω we should read Ἀτρεΐδα? Though

it is extremely unlikely on the face of it that all these seven cases before a vowel should be mere accident, I have tried a control experiment with another word metrically equivalent to Ἀτρεΐδω. The vocative Ἀτρεΐδῃ occurs forty-eight times and of all these only one is before a vowel (T. 56) and forty-seven are before a consonant. Stronger proof than this can scarcely be desired, and it is obvious that this mutually supports the elision of -οιο.

The termination in -εω—perhaps we should rather say in -ᾱ—certainly does exist in Homer, as Τυδεΐδω in E. 16, K. 566, II. 74, but this does not alter the inference about Ἀτρεΐδω. A good instance of such elision is to be found in Φ. 85, 86:

ὀνύκτηρ Ἄλταο γέροντος,
Ἄλτω, ὅς Λελέγεσσι φιλοπολέμοισιν ἀνάσσει,
where Ἄλτα, ὅς appears to be a great improvement.

On -οιο I have nothing special to say except that it is impossible to give any reason why the treatment of it should differ from the treatment of its brethren.

The elision of -οο is much more problematical. Though it may appear strange to our ears, it does not follow that the Greek epic poets would have objected to it. But it is certain that there is no passage in Homer where there is any reason for introducing this elision. If indeed in the 'genuine' portions of Homer we anywhere found a genitive in -οο agreeing with one in -οιο not at the end of a line and that genitive in -οο shortened before a vowel we might assume, to save my rule, that we ought to resolve the -οο into -οο and elide the latter -ο. But there is no such case in Homer, except in K and the beginning of Y, passages admitted by all reasonable critics to be spurious. So far as it goes then this is evidence that -οο could not be elided; but of merely negative evidence a much larger amount is required to be of any avail. This must be therefore left doubtful for the present; for myself I cannot help having a feeling for which I cannot account that this elision is inadmissible.

IV.

With the aid of the conclusions just established we may proceed to consider the agreement of -οο and -οιο in the *Iliad*. There are here forty-five cases of the exception where one of the words is at the end of a line, viz.: A. 591, B. 457, T. 112, Δ. 100, 177, 240, E. 21, 741, Z. 134, 330, H. 392, 422, Θ. 135, 411, I. 440, K. 562, A. 1, 373,

450, N. 358, 591, 601, 606, 635, Ξ . 311, O. 554, 670, 704, Π . 356, 581, P. 69, Σ . 242, 316, 399, 613, Φ . 294, 592, X. 430, 440, Ψ . 17, 280, 561, 748, Ω . 747, 755. With these may go Ω . 416: ἡ μὲν μιν περὶ σῆμα ἐοῦ ἐτάροιο φίλοι, though there -ον and -οιο are in agreement without either ending the line; read however anyway ἐοῦ ἐτάροιο.

But a new exception occurs in the *Iliad*, where one of the genitives is a monosyllable (under which I include τοῖο and σοῖο). There are six certain cases of this: Δ . 214, 494, N. 660, Ξ . 173, X. 401, and Ω . 486. The last however is slightly open to question. It runs thus: μῆσαι πατρός σοῖο, θεοὶς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχαιῶν, Τηλίκου, ὥσπερ ἐγών. Here we might read τηλίκου' ὥσπερ, if the elision of -οο be regarded as possible. In all the other five the monosyllable is τοῦ. Besides these are A. 380: τοῖο δ' Ἀπόλλων Εὐξαμένου ἤκουσεν, where read εὐξαμένου'; Z. 465: σοῦ θ' ἑλκθμοῖο πυθέσθαι, where perhaps σόο; Σ . 335: μεγαθύμου σοῖο φωνῆς (where Bekker is probably right in restoring σοῖο for σείο); here however read μεγαθύμοο; T. 322: τοῦ πατρός ἀποφθιμένοιο πυθόμενῃ, where perhaps τόο.

Besides these there remain seventeen passages to be considered:

- B. 145. πόντον Ἰκαρίοιο, τὰ μὲν
B. 746. υἱὸς ὑπερβύμοιο Κορώνης Καινεῖδαο . .
E. 315. πέπλοιο φαεινοῦ π. τγμα κάλυψεν
H. 119, 174, P. 189, T. 73, Φ . 422. δηῖον ἐκ πολέμοιο
I. 219. τοῖχον τοῦ ἐτέροιο, θεοῖσι δὲ . . .
K. 107. ἐκ χόλου ἀργαλέοιο μεταστρέψῃ . . .
K. 246. τοῦτον γ' ἐσπομένοιο καὶ ἐκ πυρός. . .
K. 501. ποικίλου ἐκ δίφροιο νοήσατο
A. 89. σίτον τε γλυκεροῖο περὶ φρένας . .
P. 667. ἀργαλέον πρὸ φόβοιο ἔλωρ . . .
Y. 5. Οὐλίμποιο πολυπύχον· ἡ δ' ἄρα πάντῃ.
 Ψ . 340. κύκλου ποικίλου· λίθον δ'
 Ψ . 431. ὅσα δὲ δίσκου οὖρα κατομαδίοιο πέλονται.

Of these read in B. 145, πόντου', in H. 119 and the four passages with it, δηῖοι' ἐκ, in I. 219, τοῖχοο τοῦ ἐτέροιο, in A. 89, σίτοῦ. As to B. 746, K. 246, Ψ . 340, 431, if any one wishes to save the credit of such old offenders as K and the Catalogue and the games in Ψ , it is easily done by reading τοῦτοο, κύκλοο, δίσκου' οὖρα. Again K. 107, 501, Y. 5 are all from notorious interpolations; none but out-and-out Gladstonians (in the Homeric sense) can defend K or the opening of Y. E. 315 occurs in a less certain but still practically certain interpolation, the wounding of Aphrodite, which includes E. 311-431. See Mr. Leaf's introduction to the book. Two good

proofs of this may be found in the form Ἐρμείας in 390 and the scansion of Αἰνείας as a molossus in 311, it being elsewhere quadrisyllabic.¹ I mention these two alone as they are not specified by Mr. Leaf—add and consider his notes on 330, 338, 340, 356, 370, 374, 383, 418, 431. Here the alteration of φαεινοῦ to φαεινόν would be slight but unsatisfactory.

One passage alone is left, P. 667; a line not easy to alter or to reject, but a very curious one. It may be what Aristarchus read, but I cannot help feeling doubtful whether it is what Homer sang. Mr. Pratt calls πρὸ φόβοιο "an obscure expression," and cannot decide what it means; no more could the Scholiast; Heyne explains the sentence to be μὴ προ-λίποιεν μιν (διὰ) φόβου, ἔλωρ δηῖοισι! Still no obvious emendation is to be made, and it seems necessary to allow this one exception to the rule in the older portions of the *Iliad*.

It is worth observing that B. 145, πόντον Ἰκαρίοιο was altered for another reason by T. S. Brandreth in his *Dissertation on the Metre of Homer* (Pickering, 1844), § 31. 'At B. 145, for πόντον Ἰκαρίοιο, read πόντοφιν, Ἰκαρίοιο, for the genitive case cannot be made long before a vowel, except in caesura, as Dunbar has observed. So at B. 198, for δηῖον τ' ἄνδρα, where the τε is inadmissible, read δηῖοφιν ἄνδρα.' His remedy however is worse than the disease.

A more interesting passage is E. 487. Here the MSS read with trifling variations μὴ πως, ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνον ἀλόντε πανάγρου. Bentley altered the line to μὴ πως, ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνον πανάγροιο ἀλόντες, and Axt to μὴ πως, ὡς πανάγροιο λίνον ἀψῖσιν ἀλόντες, both thus falling into the same error (besides the un-Homeric short a before γρ, which Bentley vainly labours to defend). The other alteration, ἀψῖσι λίνοιο ἀλόντε πανάγρου, has avoided Scylla only to fall into Charybdis. That in three alterations of one line no less than five mistakes should have been committed should teach us to be cautious indeed in altering the text of Homer, so marvellously faithful under unnatural difficulties.

The two forms of the genitive are united by Pindar in *Nem.* vii. 42: εὐθυπνόου Ζεφύροιο, and *fragm.* 136: πολυχρόσιοιο πλοῦτον. There is at least one case in Euripides, Διονόοιο βάχκον in *Hippol.* 560. More could probably be added with ease from him and other lyrical poets. For iambs see Lycophron, 857, 994.

I will only add that after careful investiga-

¹ The only other case of Αἰνείας as a trisyllable is N. 494; N. is full of strange things of the kind.

tion I have come to the conclusion that proper names, which so often exercise a disturbing influence in verse, have exercised none or scarcely any in this case.

V.

There are only two violations of the rule in the Homeric *Hymns* (Hermes 185, Aphrod. 147), none in the *Epigrams*, and none in the *Batrachomyomachia*. This is fairly strong evidence, though only negative, in favour of a considerable antiquity for the mass of those poems, considering their bulk.

The *Works and Days*, the only poem safely to be attributed to Hesiod, gives remarkable results; indeed when I first looked back at my own notes I could not trust them without a fresh examination of the poem. For he is stricter than even Homer; in the whole 828 lines there is only one case of agreement of the two forms of the genitive even at the end of a line (*χαρασσομένωιο σιδίρου* in 387). The poem however is hardly

long enough to build upon with great certainty. In 326 and 733 read of course:

ὅς τε κασιγνήτωι τοῖ' ἀνὰ δέμνια βαίῃη, and
μηδ' ἀπὸ δυσφύμοιο τάφοι' ἀπονοστήσαντα.

When we come to the other Hesiodic poems the case is very different. In the short *Shield of Heracles* there are two violations of the rule (71, 153), and in the *Theogony* five (683, 737, 788, 808, 852). In the latter poem these figures support in a remarkable manner the belief generally entertained that the later part of the *Theogony* is also later in date. Not that either division is probably due to Hesiod, as indeed Pausanias hints repeatedly that the *Theogony* was not by him.

This argument then would confirm to some extent the opinion that the *Works and Days* dates from a great antiquity, and the same is true to a less extent of the majority of the smaller Homeric poems, but that the latter part of the *Theogony* and the *Shield of Heracles* are more modern.

ARTHUR PLATT.

CATALOGUE OF CLASSICAL MANUSCRIPTS.

Now that the longer days of the year are commencing and afford time, which cannot be found in winter, over and above the hours of official work, I make a beginning of the Catalogue of Classical Manuscripts, announced in October last, with descriptions of the MSS. of Homer in the British Museum. If others can find time during the ensuing summer to contribute particulars of classical MSS. in other libraries, the Catalogue may make substantial progress before the close of the year.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

HOMER—ILIAD.

1.—BRIT. MUS. **Papyrus** cvii. Two fragments: 2 ft. 5 in. × 10 in.; 3 ft. $\frac{3}{4}$ in. × 10 in. Uncials. I cent. B.C. (?) Found at Ma'abdey in Egypt in 1849 and 1850.

Bought, for Brit. Mus., of Miss S. Harris, 1872.

'Ιλιάς: xviii 1—171, 172—218 (the first words), 311—617.

Omitted lines added in margins by later hand.

Text printed in Cat. Anc. MSS.

2.—BRIT. MUS. **Papyrus** xciv. 7 ft. $7\frac{1}{2}$ in. × $9\frac{1}{2}$ in. Uncials. II cent.

Bought at Elephantine in Egypt by Mr. W. J. Bankes, in 1821. Bought, for Brit. Mus., of Mr. W. R. Bankes, 1879.

'Ιλιάς: Bk. xxiv; wanting ll. 1—126.

Omitted lines added in margins by later hand.

Collation by G. C. Lewis in 'Philological Museum,' i. 177. See Cat. Anc. MSS.

3.—BRIT. MUS. **Add. MS.** 17,210. Vellum: ff. 60. $11\frac{1}{2}$ × $9\frac{3}{8}$ inches. Uncials. VI cent.

Belonged to the Syrian Convent of St. Mary Deipara in the Nitrian Desert in Egypt. Bought, for the Brit. Mus., of A. Pacho, 1847.

'Ιλιάς: fragments of bks. xii—xvi, xviii—xxiv. *Palimpsest*.

Ed. W. Cureton: 'Fragments of the Iliad of Homer from a Syriac Palimpsest,' 1851. See Cat. Anc. MSS.

4.—BRIT. MUS. **Egerton MS.** 267. Vellum: ff. 19. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ inches. Minuscules, under the ruled lines. XII cent.

'Ιλιάς: xxii. 193—236.

5.—BRIT. MUS. **Burney MS.** 86. Vellum : ff. 281. $12 \times 9\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules, under the ruled lines. Finished Saturday, 18th September, 13th Indiction. There is no year in a 13th Indiction, between 1059 and 1344, in which the 18th September fell on a Saturday. Judging from the writing of the MS., the first year is obviously too early; the other is certainly too late. The MS. appears to be of XIII century. The date may have been copied from an earlier MS.; or the scribe, writing so soon after the beginning of a new Indiction, may have carelessly inscribed the number of the one which had just expired. In this case the year might be either 1210 or 1255.

Owners: John Towneley, of Towneley, co. Lanc. (bookplate); Charles Townley, 1771; Charles Burney, 1814; Charles Parr Burney, 1818. The Burney MSS. were purchased for the Brit. Mus. in 1818.

Ἰλιάς: with full scholia and glosses.

Collat. C. G. Heyne, 1802. See Cat. Burn. MSS.; Palaeogr. Soc. pl. 67.

6.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5693 (ff. 23–303). Paper: ff. 281. $12 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy; *circa* A.D. 1400.

Owners: 'Res Gasparis Volaterrani, apostolicæ sedis protonotarii'; 'Antonii Seripandi et amicorum.' Bought, for the Harley Library, 2 Feb. 1724.

Ἰλιάς: partial scholia and glosses.

Hector's Epitaph, at the end, in a later hand.

7.—BRIT. MUS. **King's MS.** 16. Vellum : ff. 281. $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy, 'πόντος Χριστοφόρου,' A.D. 1431.

Ἰλιάς: with Life, *etc.*, prefixed.

Coloured initials to the several books.

8.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5600. Vellum : ff. 239. $13\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written at Florence by John Rhosos, priest, of Crete; finished 16 May, 1466.

Bought, for the Harley Library, of John Gibson, 13 Sept. 1722.

Ἰλιάς: exegesis of Herodotos, arguments, epigrams, *etc.*, prefixed.

A full-page miniature of Homer, within a border, facing the first page of the text, which is also ornamented with a border of the vine-pattern.

9.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 1771. Paper : ff. 495. $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. XV cent.

Bought, for the Harley Library, of Alexander Cunningham, who purchased it in Italy from the daughter of Carlo Patini.

Ἰλιάς: arguments except to Bk. i.; scholia and glosses in red ink.

Imperf.; ends xxiv. 719.

See Cat. Harl. MSS.

10.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5672. Vellum : ff. 23. $11\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. XV cent.

The ff. 19–23, which had belonged to Caesar de Missy of Berlin, in 1748, were presented to the Brit. Mus. and added to the MS. in 1807.

Ἰλιάς: ii. 1–9, 490–594; iii. 123–461; iv. 1–246.

11.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5601 (ff. 6b–281.) Paper: ff. 276. $13 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy, 'ἄγγελος γράφην.' XV–XVI cent.

Bought, for the Harley Library, of Nathaniel Noel, bookseller, 18 Jan. 1724.

Ἰλιάς: prolegomena, *etc.* Glossed throughout in red ink.

Hector's Epitaph at the end.

12.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 1675 (ff. 107–129). Paper: ff. 23. 10×7 inches. Minuscules. Written in France; A.D. 1591.

Ἰλιάς: Bk. i.; argument and prefaces.

The early part annotated and glossed in Latin.

13.—BRIT. MUS. **Add MS.** 8232 (ff. 186–197). Paper: ff. 12. 13×8 inches. Minuscules. Written probably in Venice. XVII cent.

Bought at Lord Guildford's sale, 1830; bookplate: Hon. Frederic North.

Ἰλιάς: i. 1–337; with part of commentary of Eustathius and glosses.

Binding in Venetian style.

ODYSSEY.

14.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5674. Vellum : ff. 150. $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules, under the ruled lines. XIII cent.

Owner: Antonio Seripandi, 16th cent. Bought, for the Harley Library, 2 Feb. 1724.

Ὀδυσσεύς: scholia and glosses.

Collations: ed. Porson, 1800; Buttman 'Scholia Antiqua'; J. A. Cramer 'Anecd. Paris,' iii. 411. See Palaeogr. Soc. pl. 85.

15.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5658. Vellum : ff. 260. $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. *Μετὰ γράφην ἢ τοῦ δαήτρου ὁδυσσεύς ἀναδάμασι μὲν τοῦ ἐντιμωτάτου ἀνδρὸς κυροῦ βαρβολομαίου τοῦ κρυσπιανοῦ, χειρὶ δὲ ἰωάννου ἱερέως βόσσου τοῦ κρητός.* Finished at Rome 10 Aug. 1472.

Bought, for the Harley Library, of Dr. Conyers Middleton of Cambridge, with other MSS. brought by him from Italy, 20 Feb. 1724.

Ὀδυσσεύς.

Fanciful initial letters to the several books, coloured brown.

16.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 6325. Vellum : ff. 216. $11 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. XV cent.

Bought, for the Harley Library, of John Gibson, 13 Sept. 1722.

Ὀδυσσεύς: arguments, a few scholia and glosses, in red ink.

Initial letters in gold on flowered grounds. On f. 1. a head-piece defaced, a border of flower-work, and a shield of arms: party per saltire *or* and *vert*, a lion rampant counter-changed; over all an escutcheon, *argent*, a cross *gules* (a Florentine family ?)

17.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5673. Paper : ff. 213. $11\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. Early XVI cent.
Bought, for the Harley Library, of John Gibson, 13 Sept. 1722.

Ὀδυσσεΐα : arguments.

Iambic verses on the *Odyssey* added at the end. A few notes in Latin.

HYMNS.

18.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 1752 (ff. 2-5). Paper : ff. 4. 9×6 inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. XV cent.
Belonged to Humphrey Wanley.

"Ὀμήρου ὕμνοι ἐς θεοὺς"

1. "ἐς ἄρην." f. 2.
2. "ἐς ἄρτεμιν." f. 2.
3. "ἐς ἀφροδίτην." f. 2b.
4. "ἐς ἀθηνᾶν." f. 2b.
5. "ἐς ἥραν." f. 2b.
6. "ἐς δημητράν." f. 3.
7. "ἐς ῥέαν." f. 3.
8. "ἐς ἡρακλέα." f. 3.
9. "ἐς ἀσκληπιόν." f. 3b.
10. "ἐς κάστορα καὶ πολυδεύκη." f. 3b.
11. "ἐς ἑρμῆν." f. 3b.
12. "ἐς ἀπόλλω[να δῶλιον]" : ends l. 55. f. 4.

BATRACHOMYOMACHIA.

19.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5693 (ff. 13-18). Paper : ff. 6. $12 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. XV cent.

Bound with a MS. of the *Iliad*, q.v.

Βατραχομυομαχία : glosses.

20.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5664 (ff. 25-38). Paper : ff. 14. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. Late XV cent.

Belonged to the Jesuit College of Agen in France.

Βατραχομυομαχία : full glosses, in red ink ; a few scholia.

21.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 6301 (ff. 6-22). Paper : ff. 17. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. Late XV cent.

Βατραχομυομαχία : a few scholia and glosses in red ink.

22.—BRIT. MUS. **Burney MS.** 276 (ff. 16-19). Paper : ff. 4. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy. Late XV cent.

Βατραχομυομαχία ll. 35-152 : glosses.

23.—BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 5601 (ff. 1-6). Paper : ff. 6. $13 \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ inches. Minuscules. Written in Italy XV-XVI cent. With the *Iliad*, q.v.

Βατραχομυομαχία : glosses in red ink.

REVIEWS.

NEWMAN'S POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE.

The Politics of Aristotle with an Introduction, Two Prefatory Essays and Notes Critical and Explanatory. By W. L. NEWMAN, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, and formerly Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Vol. I. (pp. xx., 580) *Introduction to the Politics*. Vol. II. (pp. lxxvii., 419) *Prefatory Essays. Books I. and II. Text and Notes*. Oxford : Clarendon Press. 1887. 28s.

MR. NEWMAN'S long looked for work has at length appeared, to be welcomed by all scholars ; but it is still unfinished. A 'volume or volumes, completing the work will,' the editor hopes, 'follow after a not too long interval.' Even as it stands, this is perhaps the most complete commentary on the greater and more important part of the *Politics*, which has yet appeared ; and it is not likely to be easily or soon superseded. The Introduction deals in so much detail with Books III., IV., V. (= III., VII., VIII. of old order) that the promised notes on these books will be shorter than those

now given on I. and II. There is not a page of the Introduction nor of the Notes that does not contain much that is suggestive and valuable either to the Aristotelian student or to those interested in Greek history or in political philosophy : and it is not often that such varied and exact learning is combined with so much grace and felicity of style. Receiving much, we cannot help asking for more. We cannot but regret that Mr. Newman has not given greater consideration to the convenience (may we even say, the indolence) of his readers. An Introduction of 563 pages, in which the various subjects are treated according to an order which requires some effort to discover and which differs in many respects from the way in which they occur in any arrangement of the books of the *Politics*, is apt to provoke impatience, however brilliantly it is written. There is, as yet, no Index : there are no divisions into chapters or sections. There is a marginal analysis, it is true ; but that sometimes occurs at rare intervals, and occasionally extends down the greater part

of a page, so as rather to defeat its own purpose. This analysis is also given as a Table of Contents, but that extends over nineteen pages of small print. All this makes the wealth of the Introduction a little less accessible than need be. He that searches diligently, still more he that reads every word, will be amply rewarded for his pains; but why should a scholar, not being a German, impose superfluous pains on his younger brethren?

The text of Books I. and II., printed in Vol. II., is based on that of Susemihl, and Mr. Newman assumes that his reader will have Susemihl's edition of 1872 with its *apparatus criticus* before him. He has collated these two books in the C. C. C. Oxf. MS. (referred to by Susemihl in his edition of the *Ethics* as O¹ but not previously collated for the *Politics*): and he finds this MS. to be nearly akin to Susemihl's P¹. He has also collated the Phillips MS., the Ball. Coll. MS. (Susemihl's o), and, in parts, a Bodleian MS. of the old Latin translation. Mr. Newman's text differs from Susemihl's chiefly in following the MSS. of the second family rather than those of the first. This preference he finds to be confirmed by the recently re-discovered Vatican palimpsest fragments of Books III. and IV. (old). But, why are the critical notes printed behind, instead of underneath, the text? This is an inconvenience often necessary in the case of explanatory notes; but in the case of critical notes, the necessity hardly exists and the inconvenience is very much greater.

Throughout the work the books of the *Politics* are quoted according to an order which differs from the order in the MSS. and also in one respect from the 'new' order of St. Hilaire, Spengel, Susemihl, &c. (adopted by Bekker in ed. min. 1855). Mr. Newman places the books (if we call them by their old numbers) as follows: I., II., III., VII., VIII., IV., V., VI. Thus, when he speaks of the Eighth Book, he means neither VIII. of the MSS. nor VIII. of St. Hilaire, &c. In referring to particular passages he always adds the old number in brackets, but in speaking of a book generally, this is not invariably done, and the consequence is a quite unnecessary additional trouble to the reader. In fact, on this whole question of 'emended' arrangements, there seems a want of common sense (in both meanings of the term) among scholars. However strongly convinced any one may be of the rightness of a conjectural rearrangement, and however advisable he may think it to expound a treatise, or even to print it, in this new order,

what justifies him in naming and quoting books except by their traditional numbers? Suppose every Hebrew scholar, who constructed a chronological order of the Psalms, were to insist on always quoting them by his new numbers, we should only have this principle carried out to its logical absurdity. In the work before us the question of the order of the books is nowhere expressly discussed. In Vol. II., pp. xxxix. and xl. Mr. Newman endeavours to account for the 'displacement' of IV. and V. (= old VII. and VIII.). One of his suggestions is that displacements may have occurred when works were transcribed from papyrus to parchment (*i. e.* according to Birt, as quoted in the footnote, in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era). But can this suggestion be applied to the *Politics*? 'If Meineke is right, and the short sketch of the political teaching of the Peripatetics contained in the *Ecloge* of Stobaeus (2, 6, 17) is taken from the work of Areius Didymus, the instructor of the Emperor Augustus' (Vol. II., p. xvii.), then, since this epitome follows the traditional order of the books, the alleged displacement must have taken place long before the period of transcriptions to parchment. To explain how the supposed better order could have changed to the existing worse is of course a necessary part of the problem, but not the whole problem. Now in Vol. II., pp. xxv.-xxvii., Mr. Newman admits that 'it is not by any means certain that the Fourth and Fifth Books [= old VII. and VIII.] were in existence when the Sixth and Eighth [= old IV. and VI.] were penned. . . . It is possible that Aristotle went on with the Sixth Book after completing the Third, instead of proceeding with the sketch of the best State.' (Compare what is said Vol. I. p. 493 foot.) This agrees exactly with the hypothesis of Hildenbrand (*Geschichte und System der Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie*, p. 370),¹ viz., that Aristotle intended to go on with his account of the ideal State after Book III., but put off doing so and was attracted by an examination of actually existing states in Book IV., V., VI. (old). This hypothesis seems to explain all the difficulties of the case better than any other. Above all, it

¹ We have not found this work mentioned by Mr. Newman. A complete list of the authorities consulted by him would have been very serviceable. We have found two allusions to Oncken's *Staatslehre des Aristoteles*, but this book is not referred to in some places where we might have expected it, (*e.g.* with regard to the 'Laconizing' party at Athens or in connexion with the discussion on Slavery). Are we to conclude that Mr. Newman has not found it specially useful?

explains the incompleteness of VIII. (old), in comparison with which the incompleteness of VI. (old) is a very trifling matter. As Mr. Newman holds (II. p. xxix.), it seems probable that no considerable part of the *Politics* has been lost, and that it was never finished. The avoidance of *hiatus* in VIII. (old) might be sufficiently explained by supposing Aristotle (or his editors) to have used some previous writing on Education to complete the unfinished work so far as possible. In Vol. I., p. 14, Mr. Newman asks: 'Should not the careful analysis of social tendencies, which we find, for instance, in the book on *Revolutions*, have preceded and paved the way for the attempt to depict a best state?' Well, so it does, according to the old order, in which, as we have just said, we suppose Aristotle to have written his treatise (and which in this respect fulfils the very rough programme of the *Politics* at the end of *Eth. Nic.*). It is surely unreasonable to assume the changed order and then from that point of view to find fault with Aristotle. The curious repetition in VI. (old) of subjects already treated in IV. (old) seems to us a problem more needing solution than the position of VII. and VIII. (old); but for Mr. Newman's account of that we must wait till we have his later volumes.

In spite of his general caution, Mr. Newman seems occasionally to show the tendency of many scholars to apply absurdly rigid canons of system and method to ancient authors. 'La scholastique,' says M. Janet in his *Histoire de la Science Politique*, 'a rendu les modernes plus exigeants pour l'ordre, la distribution et le développement d'un sujet.' Yet scholars apply these canons to ancient writings which may never have been finished by their authors—and Mr. Newman, be it observed, thinks the *Politics* may be merely notes for lectures—forgetful how few modern works would really stand such tests. Even in this very carefully written work of Mr. Newman's, we find in Vol. II., p. xlv., the translation of William of Moerbeke mentioned as if for the first time: and yet it has been spoken of two pages before. Are we to infer that there is a corruption or a displacement in the text?

As to the value of this *vetus versio*, Mr. Newman's remarks are worthy of attention. 'It is not absolutely clear,' he says (II., p. xlvii.), 'that we have a right (with Susemihl) to take this translation as a reproduction of a single Greek MS.' He points out that the translator may occasionally have used a marginal gloss where it seemed to him easier than the reading in the text of the MS.

before him. Thus in 1253 a 7 (I. 2, § 10), because Vet. Int. has *sicut in volatilibus*, we cannot with certainty infer that his MS. did not read *περὶ τοῖς περὶ τοῖς* may have been in the margin only, as in the case of P¹, P⁴, S^b (Vol. II., p. 64). On the other hand—to take a striking instance of the value of Vet. Int.—in 1260 b 41 (II. 1, § 2) a fraction of the MSS. of Vet. Int. (*unus qui unius*) enables us to restore εἰς ὃ τῆς, where all the Greek MSS. have ἰσότης.

In some of the remarks on Aristotle's views we find traces of an over-subtlety, which leads to superfluous fault-finding. This tendency shows itself in the Appendix (A. in Vol. II.) on the relation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* to the *Politics*. Again, why is Aristotle's placing of *ἐλαστικότητα* and *μεταλλευτική* between the natural and unnatural kinds of *χρηματιστική* considered 'strange' (Vol. I., p. 131, n. 4)? The man who gets the timber or iron for the plough is obviously a step further removed from the 'natural' means of subsistence than the man who uses the plough to get his food from nature, but his occupation is less 'unnatural' than that of the man who sells the plough, and still less than that of the man who lends money. This is clearly Aristotle's line of thought. And Mr. Newman appears practically to recognise this, though with some hesitation, in his note on the passage (I., II., § 4, 1258 b. 27). Why need any doubt be raised (as in Vol. I., p. 213, n. 3) as to Aristotle's reckoning Plato's 'timocracy' under the head of 'aristocracy'? Does not the view of each of them as to the Lacedaemonian constitution prove this? (See *Pol. IV.* (old), 7, § 4, 1293 b. 16; the passage closely following that to which Mr. Newman refers in his note.) In Vol. I., p. 219, n. 2, it is said, 'The fact that virtue, though of an imperfect kind [viz., military virtue], is recognised in the *Polity*, seems occasionally lost sight of, as for instance in 6 (4), 7, 1293 b. 10, where it is implied that in a *Polity* virtue will not be the deciding consideration in elections to office.' In the *Polity* all the citizens have this imperfect kind of virtue: consequently it cannot be used to decide elections to office. There is no oversight on Aristotle's part.

It remains to notice Mr. Newman's commentary on a few passages of special interest.

I., 2, 1252, a. 34—b. 9 (Vol. II., p. 108), Aristotle observes that among barbarians the wife is treated as a slave. 'On the other hand, Aristotle elsewhere notices the frequency of *γυναικοκρατία* among barbarians

(II., 9, 1269 b. 24 *seq.*). Both observations are probably true however we may choose to reconcile them.' Is it not clear that Aristotle has in one case observed a people in the patriarchal stage, in the other a people among whom the effects of the matriarchal stage still continued, without of course being aware that these barbarians were in different stages of social evolution? In this very chapter of the *Politics* may not the word *ὁμογύλακτας* (1252 b. 17) contain unconsciously-given evidence that the *γένος* or *κώμη* is an older social unit than the *οἰκία*? But to all these controversies raised by modern anthropologists Mr. Newman seems to make no allusion. Yet surely they are at least as relevant and important as extracts from the *Times* and the *Saturday Review*.

I., 2, 1252 b. 20 (Vol. II., p. 115). In Mr. Postgate's note, which is quoted, may not '7, 13, 11,' mean IV. (old), 13, § 11, *i. e.*, 1297 b. 25, a passage which really gives the connecting link between 1252 b. 20, and III., 15, 1286 b. 8? The chaos introduced by shuffling the numbers of the books in quotations may be responsible for many errors.

I., 2, 1253 a. 34. Mr. Newman suggests that *ὅπλα ἔχων φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ* may mean 'having arms for prudence and virtue to use' (or 'guide in use'). This certainly seems the meaning required, if only the Greek will bear it. But does the passage cited from Plutarch (*πρὸς τοὺς βασκάνους καὶ ποιηροὺς ὅπλον ἢ παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν εἴνοια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἐστίν*) support this use of the dative? There the dative is explained by *ἐστίν*.

II., 2, 1261 a. 27 (Vol. II., pp. 231, 232). It is a little difficult to find what is Mr. Newman's final decision about this passage, except that he refers the clause *ὅταν μὴ . . .* 'Ἀρκάδες τοῖς ἔθνος' rather than to *πόλεις*. May not the meaning be as follows: 'And a city differs in this respect [*viz.*, in not being composed of merely similar elements] from a nation, even [*καὶ* being taken with *ὅταν*, &c.] when the nation is no longer scattered in villages but like the Arcadians [brought together into a so-called 'Great City,' which after all is only a mere aggregate of villages, and not a true city-state]? Aristotle would thus be scoffing at Megalopolis and the Arcadian confederacy as constituting no true *πόλις*. (This interpretation has been suggested to me by Mr. W. Ashburner, Fellow of Merton College, who calls attention to Pausanias VIII., 27, pp. 653-655, esp. § 5, where he speaks of townships being *forced* into Megalopolis.)

As to II., 12, Mr. Newman's suggestion

commends itself. 'The guess is perhaps permissible that Aristotle may have left only the fragment about Solon and a few rough data for insertion after the notice of the Carthaginian constitution, and that some member of the school, not very long after his death, completed them as he best could' (Vol. II., p. 377).

To the famous puzzle about 'the one man who gave a middle constitution to Greece' (6, *i. e.*, old IV., 11, 1296, a. 38 *sq.*), Mr. Newman (Vol. I., p. 470) answers 'Theramenēs,' comparing Thuc. VIII., 97. There certainly seems much force in the argument that Aristotle would be more likely to veil a reference to Theramenēs than an allusion to Solon or any of the recognised great legislators of Greece.

Much also may be said for the view (Vol. I., p. 277) that Aristotle, so far from finding a *παμβασιλεύς* in Alexander, rather sought, by insisting on the transcendent virtues required in his ideal king, to check the inclination for monarchical institutions which had grown up among his contemporaries.

It would be easy to multiply instances of ingenious and subtle suggestions. One of the most valuable portions of the Introduction is that in which the connexion between Aristotle's *Politics* and his metaphysical theories is pointed out—a connexion too often overlooked, but essential to a right understanding of the book. In the elucidation of Aristotle's political philosophy, Mr. Newman's wide reading has supplied him with many interesting parallels and contrasts from modern writers. We might wish indeed that it had fallen in with his plan to trace the effect of Aristotelian political conceptions upon mediaeval and modern theorists: this is a work that still remains to be done satisfactorily. The Hellenic conception of the lawgiver is admirably illustrated by the modern parallel of Calvin at Geneva—a parallel previously suggested by Rousseau (*Contr. Soc.*, II., 7). In the closing words of his Introduction, Mr. Newman, summing up his view of the Aristotelian conception of the State, points out the absence of any idea of the historical mission of States; but he does not go on to ask how that idea has arisen.

It seems necessary to apologize for having rather ungraciously occupied any space in raising objections; but what else can be done in a short notice of a great work? A reviewer cannot simply put a mark of admiration after the title. May we hope that better health will enable Mr. Newman soon to complete his great undertaking?

D. G. RITCHIE.

SIDGWICK'S *EUMENIDES*.

Aeschylus, Eumenides. With Introduction and Notes. By A. SIDGWICK, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1887. 3s.

MR. SIDGWICK'S commentary on the *Oresteia*, now complete, possesses the merits of a Variorum edition without its defects. Everything worth recording in the work of former editors is recorded. But the editor never fails to say, concisely and clearly, which reading or interpretation he prefers, and why. The book is admirable alike for its industry, its critical judgment, the thoroughness of its scholarship, and the lucidity of its style. The 'close student' is warned that Weeklein is indispensable; but many English students, it may be predicted, will henceforth be content with Sidgwick.

One may be pardoned for wishing to see what an editor of Mr. Sidgwick's sagacity and fertility of resource would do with the perplexities of an Aeschylean chorus, ξυμπαισίων μόνος μόνους καὶ δρῶν τι χρηστόν, unencumbered by the apparatus with which (p. 29) he is here equipped. But since he has preferred for the most part the more modest task of tabling and appraising the work of his predecessors, it is only fair to note the scrupulous care, acuteness, and impartiality with which this has been done, not more nor less in the case of the recent French and German commentators, Weil and Wetstein, than in that of one to whom no English student should forget to be grateful—our 'foremost English editor' of Aeschylus—Dr. Paley.

Mr. Sidgwick will not allow that the *Eumenides* is an anticlimax. It is, as he says, a drama of reconciliation. But, dramatically, reconciliations are quite capable of being dull; and tragedies do not need to end happily like novels. Moreover, is the solution of the moral problem a wholly satisfactory one? 'The human interest is thrust aside,' 'Orestes is passive in the hands of greater powers.' So far as this is so, it would seem that we have escaped from morality and taken refuge in theology. Again, is it quite true to say that the higher conception of justice defeats the lower; that Orestes was morally innocent though technically guilty; that the Furies embody the lower view that 'guilt lies in the deed,' Apollo the higher,

that 'the innocent heart must be saved'? Surely this lowers the conception of the Erinyes too much. The embodiment of a merely technical justice is not venerable either at Athens or elsewhere, and can never be converted into a benign and gracious power. And the pleadings before the Areopagus are not accordant with this view. It is Apollo who has recourse to the ultra-technical plea that the mother is not the parent.

If we may not say that the Furies are identified with conscience, they co-exist with it; when its requirements are satisfied, they are appeased. The law which they administer is the unwritten and eternal law of humanity, and conscience is its sanction. Human nature, permanently and inexorably, asserts the right of the mother to the reverence of the child, the right of the weak to the protection of the strong; and the violated right avenges itself. Though the Erinyes and the 'Curse' are in their operation often identified, it needs no 'Curse' to evoke the Erinyes; the deed itself evokes her. The persecuted beggar (*Od.* 17, 475), no less than the murdered mother, has an Erinyes, so long as human nature attests his sanctity. Sometimes the Erinyes works in and through the conscience of the offender, sometimes independently of it. A dulled or hardened conscience does not exempt from punishment; it is commonly an aggravation of guilt. But it cannot become an instrument of punishment. An Aegisthus cannot be dealt with as an Orestes. The sensitive soul is torn by remorse: the vulgar criminal meets with the fate he can understand.

Orestes has acted under the stress of an overwhelming conviction of duty, and yet he is conscience-stricken by the sight of the blood which he has spilt. The conviction of the necessity remains, but with it remains the horror of the deed. It seems to him that a terrible necessity has made it his *duty* to do a *crime*. He is divided between self-justification and remorse. It was right and it was wrong; it was inevitable and it was horrible. The voice of Apollo approves; the voice of the Avengers condemns. With all the strength of his conviction he contends against the condemnation, and ultimately he prevails. More dramatically—so at least it seems to a modern reader—and more truly he would have prevailed, had some new need

for action (as when Timoleon, inconsolable for the death of his brother, was called to save Syracuse) at once made clear to him the purity of his own motives in the past, and lifted him for the future out of the reach of all self-questionings and doubts. But he prevails, the accusers are defeated, and in the end (by the offer of local honours from Athene) appeased. So far as Orestes is concerned, the knot of the ethical difficulty is rather cut than solved. When the verdict goes against them, the anger of the Erinyes is transferred to the Athenian land and people. And when Athene binds herself, on behalf of the people of Athens, to plant the grove of the Avengers beside the temple of Erechtheus, on them, and not on Orestes, is breathed the gracious whisper of peace, the pardon and benediction. But though in this final *dénouement* Orestes is forgotten, the character of the Erinyes is fully vindicated. It was not because, though keen to scent blood, they were blind to read motives, that Orestes was pursued by them; but because Orestes was of too sensitive and noble nature not to be haunted by agonies of misgiving whether indeed his heart was clean, his hands being so foul. Every pang of torture that he suffered testified, not to the cruelty or blindness of the Retributive Forces, but to the strength in a good man of the natural piety which so recoils from the commission of an unnatural deed, however necessary, however righteous. And it is to be remembered how studiously Aeschylus divides the guilt in the first instance between Agamemnon and Clytaemnestra, so that the duty of Orestes does not lie altogether clear and unmistakable and all on one side; and how Sophocles, who does not divide the guilt, but makes Clytaemnestra bear all of it, has no Furies.

Mr. Sidgwick justly extols the closing scene of the *Eumenides* as (even on the small stage at Cambridge) a fine and impressive spectacle. But it has to be admitted that its interest is spectacular rather than dramatic, and patriotic or political rather than ethical. When we say this, and say it regretfully, we are thinking, not of the *Eumenides* as it is in itself, but of the *Eumenides* as a sequel to the *Agamemnon*. Mr. Sidgwick objects to the 'common view' that the *Eumenides* was intended as a 'protest' against recent democratic changes affecting the constitution of the Areopagus. Aeschylus, he says, was too great an artist to have thus descended into the political arena. But that 'neither license nor tyranny' means oligarchy cannot be doubted; and is

admitted by Mr. Sidgwick in his note (l. 696). Müller says, 'Not only is the mythological texture of the play pervaded by political allusions, but the whole treatment of the myth so turns upon political institutions deemed of paramount importance in those times that one may for a while fancy the audience assembled in the theatre to be an Ecclesia convened for the purpose of deliberating on matters of state and law.' Reactionaries have commonly extolled moderation; and the poet, who in the mid-stream of the democratic movement so eloquently deprecated excess, and magnified the institution which the democracy had just shorn of most of its powers, would hardly have desired to be acquitted of the charge of lending his art to a party purpose. The least polemical way of doing this was to extol what the Areopagus still retained, the jurisdiction in cases of homicide. This Aeschylus does; whether he also laments the powers which it had lost is a question requiring perhaps for its answer a more exact knowledge than we possess of the provisions of the *psephisma* of Ephialtes.

One or two remarks upon the notes may perhaps be added. 8. *παρώνυμον* 'altered from hers' rather than 'made like to hers.' 30. No abridgment: *τῶν πρὶν εἰσόδον* gen. of comparison. 36. 'Move quickly' suits *ὑπερικταίνοντο* (or *ὑπερακταίνοντο*), *Od.* 23, 3, and probably *ἄκτανώσῃ* ('put into swift motion'), Plato, *Legg.* 672 c. 38. *ἀντίρριος* etc. are ordinary 'objective' compounds like *ἐγχορίος* or *παράνομος*. 64—178. Apollo does not 'prophesy the wanderings' of Orestes. He says 'The Furies will haunt you wherever you go, over land or sea. But fear them not; go to Athens, and they shall haunt you no more.' 86. Object of *τὸ μὴ μέλειν* is justice: 'since you know it, practise it.' 93. Not 'men will pity you because Hermes conducts you,' but 'Zeus honours (pities) the outlaw, and shows it by providing him with escort' (*εὐ. τ.* instrumental or modal). 105. The active meaning of *ἀνθρώπος* must be right: but does it not require Hermann's *φρενῶν*? How *βροτῶν*, addressing the Furies? 115. *ψυχῆς* 'in the mouth of a ghost' may remind us of Soph. *Elect.* 841, *καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ γαίης πάμπαντος ἀνάσσει*, where Prof. Jebb quotes *Cho.* 504 *οὗτο γὰρ οὐ τέθηκας οὐδέ περ θανόν*. 127. *κύριοι* perhaps 'masterful.' 172. Mr. Sidgwick rightly refuses to identify Fates with Furies; unnecessarily leans to supposed allusion to Alcestitis. 349—370. These lines, the most difficult strophe and antistrophe in the *δέσμιος ὕμνος*, are fully discussed in Notes and Appendix. Weil's

reading of the last two lines in each is adopted, and good reasons are given for preferring this on the whole to Paley's. But *αἵματος νέον* (gen. of cause) is hardly convincing; nor is *νέον* quite the epithet we expect. *δύσφορον μάταν* (Weil, for *ἀταν*) is questionable: why does Mr. Sidgwick translate it 'a toil intolerable'? [The word in *Cho.* 918 seems to mean 'rashness' or 'folly,' and in *Supp.* 820 'quest.']. The important correction *ἐμαῖς μελέταις* (361) is by an oversight not assigned to its author (H. Voss, according to Paley). Mr. Sidgwick with the Schol. explains *ἔθνος τόδε* as 'the race of murderers,' remarking that the Furies would hardly call themselves *ἀξιώμοσιν*. But what is the point of 'The punishment of the murderer belongs to us and not to the gods: for Zeus does not like to converse with murderers'? Whereas *ἀξιώμοσιν*, said of the Furies, accords well with the ironical tone of the passage. 'We punish the guilty, but do not pollute the gods with our touch or offend them with our black-robed presence at their banquets. Far be it from us to trouble them with a duty which is ours, or come to controversy with them. Zeus deigns not to commune with our hateful tribe, dripping with blood.' Which means 'Let them keep off their hands, and not come to controversy with us.' Mr. Sidgwick, less naturally, takes the subject of *ἐλθεῖν* to be the crime ('and that it come not to trial'). 405. Mr. Sidgwick's explanation of this as metaphorical (comparing *αἰγίδος ἡνιόχος Nub.* 602) is certainly right. 423. Mr. Sidgwick is probably right in taking *μηδαμοῦ* with *νομίζεται*, and explaining the negative as due to the 'generic' character of the relative clause. 'Generic,' but not 'indefinite.' Not 'Wherever it is not the fashion' (*ὅπου ἂν μὴ νομίζεται*), but 'In a place where it is not the fashion,' viz. Hades. A 'generic' clause may refer to a definite antecedent, an 'indefinite' clause cannot. *πὼς δ' οὐκ ἂν, ἥτις ἐκ Διὸς πάσχω κακῶς*; (*Prom.* 759) is 'generic,' with causal meaning: ('Should not I rejoice, being such an one?') Latin, *quae* with subjunctive. *πὼς δ' οὐκ ἂν, ὅστις πάσχοι*; ('Would not anyone who...?') would be 'indefinite': Latin, *quicumque*. 428. *ὁ ἥμις τοῦ λόγου* hardly

justifies *ἥμις λόγον*. 430. *πράξει* seems to require *δικαίως*, and *κλύειν δικαίως* might stand. ('To have *δικαίως* said of you, rather than to act *δικαίως*.) 432. *τὰ μὴ δίκαια μὴ νικᾶν* indirect for *τὰ μὴ δίκαια μὴ νικᾶτε*. 496. What is the meaning of *ἐνυμα*? Should it be *ἐτοῖμα*, with *ὑπέκδυσιν* (for the obscure *ὑπόδοσιν*) in the antistrophe? 506. *ἄκα τ' οὐ βέβαια*: *τλάμων* δέ τις παραγορεῖ is perhaps right. ('The comforter is in need of comfort.') *μάταν* is improbable, and *τλάμων* can hardly stand alone. 523. *Μετρε* does not require the insertion of *ἂν*, and its position (to say nothing of the thrice-repeated sound) is intolerable. 599. *πέπεισθι* to be like *κέκραχθι* &c. should be *πέπισθι*. Compare *ἐπέπινυν*, (*Curtius, Verb. Eng. Tr.* pp. 387, 402), 645. Is not *μηχανή* the subject of *λύσειεν*? (*ἔστι τοῦδ' ἄκος* parenthetical, and *καὶ* intensive with *κάρτα*.) 653. *μητρὸς ὄραμον* cannot be regarded as a divided epithet, like *τὸν νῦν χόλον παρόντα* or *ὁ πρῶτος φόρος ταχθεῖς*. It is 'kindred blood, that of a mother.' Cp. *Prom.* 804 *τὸν τε μυνώπα στρατὸν Ἀριμασπὸν ἱπποβάμον*, where a prose writer would have had to use a second article. *τοῖς τὰμὰ παραίνονσι νῦν ὀρκώματα* (768), compared with this in the note (or *αἱ Φορκίδες ναῖονσι δηναῖαι κόραι Prom.* 794) is different. The 'divided attribute' is the attribute divided by the noun which it qualifies: like 'a dedicated beggar to the air.' 655. *οὐδὲ* couples *τεθραμμένη* with *παῖς*, as if *παῖς* were a participle. 673. The construction would be improved if we might read *τοῖς ἐπισπόροις*, so as to allow *τάδε τὰ πιστὰ* to go together. 726. It should be pointed out that in all such sentences the opt. is primary (i.e. of the future, not of the past). *δίκαιον ἐνεργεῖν* virtually = *δικαίως ἂν τις ἐνεργετοίη*. 797. Why must *ἀλλὰ γὰρ* with a single verb be regarded as elliptical? *γὰρ* in the combination *εἰ γὰρ* is not a conjunction; and the possibility of putting *γὰρ* next to *ἀλλὰ* (as *ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι*) seems to show that it was not so regarded. This collocation however is found occasionally when *ἀλλὰ γὰρ* = *sed quia*. 802. *τεύχητε* a misprint for *τενέχητε*. (*βαρὸν* just before for *βαρύνει*.) 803. *σπερμάτων* after *βρωτήρας*, not *ἀνημέρους*.

R. WHITELAW.

LES SCEPTIQUES GRECS.

Les Sceptiques Grecs, par VICTOR BROCHARD.
Paris, F. Alcan. 1887. 8 frs.

DURING the interval between Aristotle and the rise of Neoplatonism the Greek Sceptics form an important factor in the history of Greek thought. Their work, besides being for the most part negative, was intermittent. Of their chief men several never published anything, the writings of others are lost, the age—even the century—of some of them is uncertain. No authoritative *catena* even of their names exists, such as the list of Stoic philosophers in the Herculanean Table. The investigation of many subtle questions turns consequently upon second or third hand statements, on the representations of disciples, on a fragmentary work of Cicero, on the gossip of Diogenes Laertius, on chance quotations by Eusebius or Galen, on an abstract in the *Myriobiblon* of Photius, on the criticisms of Augustine, lastly and chiefly on the miscellaneous compilation (itself of uncertain age) which passes under the name of Sextus Empiricus.

Historians of philosophy have not neglected this region, and much wisdom concerning it is to be found up and down in Zeller. Saisset, in his important work, *Le Scepticisme*, devoted an elaborate section to Aenesidemus, raising questions which have since been acutely discussed by Haas and Natorp; and Mr. Norman Maccoll, in his *Essay on the Greek Sceptics* (Cambridge, 1869), has treated the main features of the subject with luminous brevity. It remained for some one to handle this whole aspect of Greek philosophy with completeness in a separate work, and in performing this task M. Brochard has produced a volume which, if not remarkable for solidity, is in many ways admirable. The patient subtlety of his analysis is equalled by the clearness of his exposition. Considering the fragmentariness of the record, the remoteness of the original sources, the concretion as it were of different layers of opinion thrown down upon the page of Sextus or Diogenes or amalgamated by Cicero, out of which this airy fabric has to be reconstructed, it is no mean triumph of critical and dialectical skill to have given an account of these successive thinkers so continuously interesting, so finely varied, and on the whole so convincing as M. Brochard here presents to his readers. Some amount of repetition

was perhaps inevitable and may be taken in part compensation for the want of an index.

At the first glance the elements of this philosophy seem poor enough, and indeed there is nothing here, except perhaps Carneades's assertion of free will (p. 148 *sqq.*) and Aenesidemus's denial of causation (p. 263 *sqq.*), that is not to be found in some corner of the Platonic dialogues. All later philosophy is apt to read like *τεμάχη ἀπὸ τῶν Πλάτωνος μεγάλων δειπνίων*. But by connecting the doctrines with the characters of the men and with the circumstances of their lives and times, by testing the value of formulae through their relation to the dogmas which they opposed, by noting as it were the different accents of a series of voices that all seem to be always saying the same thing, above all by bringing together the several phases of sceptical tradition into a suggestive general view—not without fruitful applications to modern thought and science—M. Brochard succeeds in giving life and movement to what might otherwise have been a barren recital.

The difficulties on which ancient scepticism laid stress are traced back by our author, as the difficulties of his own time were by Plato, to the exaggerations of the Eleatic school, exaggerations from which Greek dogmatism never worked itself altogether free. The strength of scepticism lay in the crude conception of truth as a mere absolute with which this negative dialectic was contrasted. As M. Brochard says (p. 293) 'On ne peut formuler le principe d'identité, si on veut échapper aux subtilités des sceptiques, qu'en introduisant précisément l'idée d'une relation. "Une chose ne peut, en même temps et sous le même rapport, être et ne pas être."' Plato, once at least, comes near to this solution—'Εκείνο δ' ἤδη καὶ χαλεπὸν ἅμα καὶ καλὸν ... τὸ... τοῖς λεγομένοις οἷον τ' εἶναι καθ' ἕκαστον ἐλέγχοντα ἐπακολουθεῖν, ὅταν τέ τις ἕτερον ὢν πῇ ταῦτόν εἶναι φῇ καὶ ὅταν ταῦτόν ὢν ἕτερον, ἐκείνη καὶ κατ' ἐκείνο ὁ φησὶ τοῦτων πεπονημένοι πότερον. τὸ δὲ ταῦτόν ἕτερον ἀποφαίνειν ἀμῇ γέ πῃ καὶ τὸ θάτερον ταῦτόν καὶ τὸ μέγα μικρόν καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον ἀνόμοιον, καὶ χαίρειν οὕτω τἀναντία ἀεὶ προσφέροντα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, οὗ τέ τις ἐλεγχος οὗτος ἀληθινὸς ὅρτι τε τῶν ὄντων τυνὸς ἐφαπτομένου δῆλος νεογενὴς ὢν. (*Soph.* 259 c.) But the words of the Eleatic Stranger, which some will not accept as Plato's, prove their authenticity by nothing more than by this, that

they slept in the ear of so many succeeding centuries. Meanwhile the spirit of hypo-statising dogmatism had its way, and in the Stoics was associated with a materialistic principle, constituting a kind of natural realism. Against this stronghold chiefly the darts of the sceptic were directed from his unassailable covert.

In Pyrrho M. Brochard traces not only the world-weariness and despair of truth occasioned by the decline of national life and the jarring of the schools, but also an Oriental touch of contemplative quietism, derived from contact with the Indian gymnosophists with whom the philosopher had intercourse when, with his master Aristarchus, he followed in the train of Alexander. This point of view, although rejected by Maccoll, is certainly interesting, and may claim to have inherent probability; and the image of the great sceptic who accepted the high priesthood of his native town, and performed its duties as well as another would have done (cf. *Isocr. de Antid.* § 71), is presented in these pages with considerable impressiveness. It certainly carries more conviction than the tale, which our author does not quite discredit, of the sceptic who, out of zeal for indifferentism, allowed himself to be crucified. (It may be noted by the way that the chief of sceptics sprang from Elis, the home of *μυρτική*.)

The sceptical doctrines, or negations of doctrine, turn from the first on two pivot-questions, the criterion of knowledge and the rule of life. The genuine Pyrrhonist admits no criterion, even his negation being swept away with that which it denies, nor any rule of life save to do as others do, or to take the line of least resistance. Even he, however, does not deny the subjective reality of impressions, nor the facts of custom and opinion. But he has no real faith in dialectic, and customs are to him indifferent. If it was otherwise with Pyrrho's remote successors, the cause is partly to be sought in the obscure relations of Pyrrhonism to the New Academy.

The imaginary return to Plato, culminating in Philo Academicus, only partially exempts this school from the imputation of scepticism. Their dialectic was, indeed, a weapon of which the later Pyrrhonists largely availed themselves. Their purely subjective criterion was opposed to the Stoic *κατάληψις*, and, with mild inconclusive rationalism, they made probability the guide of life. M. Brochard's account of Carneades is particularly clear and full. His suggestion that the famous sermon against Justice was an *argumentum ad homines* as addressed to

the Romans is rather over-subtle, but his statement of the theory which the same author set against the Stoical Determinism is both subtle and clear. By a curious oversight Carneades and Philo are each said in the course of the same chapter to be at the apogee of the New Academy (pp. 186, 208), but one must not construe too strictly a rhetorical figure.

Aenesidemus, the dialectical sceptic, gives rise to several questions of great nicety, the most difficult being that occasioned by the discrepancy of statements of nearly equal authority, which represent him now as a Pyrrhonist and now as a Heraclitean. M. Brochard solves this by supposing two periods, the inherent dialectic of scepticism having led this powerful thinker to seek a ground for his opinion in Heracliteanism. There is not room to discuss this opinion here. It is a little strange, however, to find our author following Sextus in alleging Air to have been the principle of Heraclitus without reference to the more constant tradition, according to which Fire was that philosopher's element. He also assumes without hesitation that the pregnant saying *χρόνος πρῶτον σώμα* was due to Aenesidemus. The most interesting thing about Aenesidemus is the fact that he partially anticipated Hume's famous analysis of causation, expressly restricting inquiry to phenomenal succession. That Hume should have been aware of this is, of course, extremely improbable. He was but correcting and amplifying Locke's discussion about Power, but, as an eager student of Cicero's philosophical treatises, the Scottish philosopher may have been directly influenced by the reasonings of the New Academy.

Menodotus appears to have originated the last phase of ancient scepticism in formulating certain rules of observation (*τρίησους*), and even of crude experiment (*μύμησους*), again in so far anticipating modern methods. He and those who followed him were medical men, for whom in the interests of their profession some positive hold upon phenomena was indispensable. Our author, who has a quick eye for historical parallels without being their slave, regards them as the Comtists of antiquity.

According to M. Brochard, pure scepticism is extinct and cannot rise again, partly because the methods of modern investigation have provided criteria which are universally acknowledged as unquestionable, and partly because the progress of knowledge has familiarised the conception, for which the sceptics, to do them justice, had prepared

the way, of approximate or provisional certitude. But our author gives to these early thinkers their full meed of praise. They were philosophers and not mere sophists, and they assisted the advance of true inquiry by arresting judgment when in danger of going by default, and by contesting the pretensions of a crude and narrow dogmatism. There is one sphere of thought, however, which he holds to have remained untouched by their assaults, that of ideal morality. His eloquent words on this subject, though passing beyond the scope of his main inquiry, may fitly conclude the present notice.

'Quant à la morale, elle présente, au point de vue de la certitude, un caractère tout particulier. Lorsqu'il s'agit de l'idée du devoir, suivant une profonde remarque de Kant, la question n'est plus de savoir si elle a

un objet au sens ordinaire du mot : on ne demande pas si le devoir est toujours accompli sur la terre. L'idée du devoir est un idéal, une règle que l'esprit trouve en lui-même et qu'il s'agit de faire passer dans ses actes. Le fait, ici, ne précède plus l'idée ; il doit se modeler sur elle. Si l'idée du devoir s'offre nécessairement à la raison, elle ne contraint pas la volonté : ici encore, il faut à l'origine de la connaissance un acte de libre initiative. Mais, une fois que l'autorité du devoir a été reconnue (et il importe peu que ce soit par obéissance ou par persuasion), la doute a disparu. L'agent moral n'a plus besoin de jeter les yeux sur le monde pour raffermir ses croyances ; c'est en lui-même qu'il découvre la vérité ; sa volonté se suffit pleinement à elle-même. Nul ne peut faire que l'idée du devoir ne soit absolument certaine pour quiconque s'est décidé à lui obéir. Ni les démentis de l'expérience, ni les cruautés de la vie ne sauraient affaiblir la fermeté du Stoicien ; le monde peut s'écrouler sans ébranler sa foi. C'est assurément le type le plus parfait de certitude que nous puissions connaître.'

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

LYSIAS.

- (1) *The Epitaphios, with Introduction and Notes*, by F. J. SNELL, B.A., late Scholar of Balliol. Part i. Introduction and Text. Part ii. Notes. (Clarendon Press Series), 1887. 2s.

THIS is a school edition of the Funeral Oration which has come down to us under the name of Lysias, and, although few would now be prepared to maintain that it was really the work of that orator, there is no reason why it should not prove as useful for educational purposes as those kindred productions, the *Menæxenus* of Plato, and the *Panegyric* of Isocrates. It is written in good and (for the most part) easy Greek, and is suitable for boys who have read the last few books of Herodotus and have not yet begun Thucydides. Mr. Snell's handy little edition makes it easy for English schoolmasters to make the experiment of adding the *Epitaphios* to the list of subjects which may occasionally be read with advantage by boys in the fourth or fifth form. He supplies them with a very readable Introduction, a satisfactory text (that of Cobet), and some brief but (on the whole) sufficient notes. It cannot, however, be ignored that, in point of accuracy, his work would have gained by a still more thorough revision, and it is with a view to its improvement in any future edition that the following points are suggested.

The first sentence of the Preface shews that the editor is not aware that the *Epitaphios* has already been published with English notes in a very meritorious and generally accurate volume of *Select Orations of Lysias*, by Prof. W. A. Stevens (Griggs and Co.), Chicago, second ed., 1878. The Introduction is partly founded on Villemain's *Essai sur l'Oraison funèbre*; but no mention is made of the more recent dissertation by Calhaux, *de l'Oraison funèbre dans la Grèce païenne*, Valenciennes, 1861; or of the discussion respecting the authorship of the *Epitaphios* in Dobree's *Adversaria*. On p. 8 of the Introduction, the first two index figures, referring to the notes at the foot of the page, have been misplaced. Throughout the book Demosthenes is persistently described as the author of the *Epitaphios* bearing his name. Again,

NO. XIV. VOL. II.

on p. 11 we read, 'Gorgias is said to have written an *Epitaphios*,' when the fact is put beyond all dispute by the testimony of Philostratus and by the long quotation from it preserved by Dionysius (Baier and Sauppe's *Oratores Attici*, ii 129). On p. 13, we are told that 'the voice of antiquity was unanimous in ascribing the *Epitaphios* to Lysias,' but we ought to have been informed precisely that (apart from some anonymous scholiasts) there are only four persons who quote it as his, without any suspicion: Harpocration (once, s.v. *Ἐπίταφια*); Theon (once, *Rhetores Graeci*, i p. 155, Walz); Philemon; and Tzetzes. On the other hand, an authority of greater weight than any of these, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, passes over the speech in complete silence, although he has repeated opportunities for referring to it. Thus, he would almost inevitably have mentioned it in connexion with the *Menæxenus*, and elsewhere, had he supposed it was actually the work of Lysias. Again, 'the earliest assailant' of the speech was not Reiske, for he was anticipated by Valckenær (in his notes to Herodotus vii 139, ix 27 and vii 160, published by Wesseling in 1763, whereas Reiske's attack was nine years later). On this point, Mr. Snell has doubtless been misled by Le Beau, the author of a German dissertation in defence of the genuineness of the speech. To the same dissertation may be traced his quotation of a criticism by Schlegel pointing out 'the great value of Lysias' oration from the view which it presents of old Attic morals.' This criticism is so little known that he ought surely to have given us the reference to Wieland's *Attisches Museum* i 2 p. 260f, and stated the source from which he derived it. On p. 8 it is asserted that 'we are nowhere explicitly told when the custom of public funerals in the Ceramicus began.' But we are expressly informed by Diodorus (xi 33) that it was after the battle of Plataea that the Athenians first instituted the *ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος* and the funeral oration. On p. 18 what is sometimes called the great battle of Corinth (394 B.C.) is described as a 'battle at Nemea': this involves a confusion between the scene of the Nemean games and the actual site of the battle in question, which was the Nemean brook in the lower part of its course, between Corinth and Sicyon. At the close of the Introduction it is suggested that

I

'Lysias' reflexions on the less noble traits in his countrymen's nature might serve to justify the choice of our great dramatist when he makes Athens the birthplace and the abode of a Timon.' To write thus is to ignore the fact that Timon is not a mere invention of the dramatist, but an actual person familiar to us from the allusions in Aristophanes, from Plutarch's *Antonius*, and from the *Timon* of Lucian. It is simply because Timon was actually an Athenian that Shakespeare calls him so, and not because Athens was the most likely place in the world to make a man a misanthrope.

In the Text and Notes, the following details are possibly worth suggesting. The use of *ποιεῖν* for 'writing poetry' (§ 2) might have been paralleled by our old use of *make* for 'compose,' and *maker* for 'poet,' instances of which are quoted by Taylor, and also in my note on Isocr. *Pan.* § 186. The distinction between *εἰλέειν* and *βούλεσθαι* (*ibid.*), so far as concerns the Attic Orators, is better given in Shilleto's note on Dem. *F. L.* § 26 than in Buttmann's *Lexilogus*. The parallelism of sound between *φήμη* and *μῆμη* in the next § might have been illustrated from Isocr. *Pan.* § 186, and the *Helen* of Gorgias § 2. In § 5 a school-boy would probably find it easier to understand the text than the explanation, with its allusion to the proverbial phrase *Μουσῶν Λαία*, with which he would doubtless be unfamiliar, and the exact meaning of which has been a matter of some dispute. There seems to be no more reason for using this phrase instead of 'a ready prey,' than for writing *répine* and *délise* in the Introduction, where 'rule' and 'blunder' would perhaps do equally well. In § 16, (the Athenians) *διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐκείνου* (the Heracleidae) *τοῖς αὐτῶν κινδύνους ἐστεφάνωσαν*, it is difficult to acquiesce in the explanation of Auger (after Reiske) that *ἐστεφάνωσαν* means *victores effecerunt*. The word that we really require appears to me to be *ἔσωσαν*, and this conjecture is confirmed by *σωτηρία* which is applied to the Heracleidae at the close of the next §. In § 23, *λογισμῷ εἰδότες τοὺς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ κινδύνους*, the reading of the two best MSS has suggested the emendation *δεδότες* which is well worth mentioning (G. Missowa in *Hermes* xix 650). In § 29, for *φύσει περνούσθαι*, cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 896. In § 31, 41, words conjecturally introduced into the text are awkwardly denoted by marks of parenthesis, instead of angular brackets <>; and the words thus restored are oddly called 'interpolations,' whereas custom is clearly in favour of reserving that term for words rejected as spurious, instead of applying it to words inserted by critics to complete the sense. For the rhetorical question in § 34, *τίς ἰδὼν οὐκ ἂν ἐφοβήθη*; cf. §§ 40, 42, 54, 71, 73, 76, 77. In § 37, to the reference to Curtius' *Atlas von Athen* for the parting scenes on Attic tombs, add Mahaffy's *Rambles in Greece*. In § 50, *Γεφύρεα* is not a 'mountain' but a mountain-range. In § 60 it should be stated that the passage is quoted *memoriter* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* iii 10, without, however, any mention of the name of Lysias. In § 75 the construction of *ἐν μοι δοκοῦμεν...ἀποδοῦναι*, might have been briefly explained, or a reference given to Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* § 42, 2, note. In § 77, (*ὁ θάνατος*) *ἴσον ἑαυτὸν παρέχει πᾶσιν* might have been illustrated by the *aequo pede* ascribed to Death in Horace. *πρὸς* is misprinted in § 20, and *πε(ῖ)σαι* in 29; and *περιβειπνον*, the last Greek word in the notes, happens to be wrongly accentuated.

(2) *Lysiae orationes selectae*; ANDREAS WEIDNER. Leipzig (Freytag) 1888, pp. 168. 1s. 3d. stitched; 1s. 6d. bound.

THIS is a plain text of fourteen speeches of Lysias, printed in the order which the editor has found to be

the most convenient for educational purposes (*Or.* 24, 7, 10, 16, 12, 25, 13, 19, 32, 31, 30, 22, 23, 1.). By way of introduction, we have a very brief account of the Attic Orators. Aeschines is dismissed in four lines, in which room is found for a reference to his lost love-poems, but none for any mention of his connexion with the stage; Isocrates is called 'the father of rhythmical style in prose,' although he was preceded by Gorgias and Thrasymachus (Cicero, *Orator* § 175); and, for the birth of Lysias, the date of Dionysius, B.C. 459, is regarded as probable, although this would make him no less than 56 years of age before beginning the profession of a *λογγράφος*. We have also short but sufficient arguments to all the selected speeches, and an explanatory index to the more difficult words and the proper names. Most of the latter have their meanings illustrated by modern equivalents, such as Richard for 'Ἀριστοκράτης, Robert for Κλεοφῶν, Roland for Περικλῆς, and Walter for 'Ἀρχίστρατος and Πολέμαρχος. But it may be questioned whether such illustrations are of any real value to the student; and there is more to be said in favour of such a treatment of names of places. Thus 'Ραυνοῦς is rendered *Dornburg* and *Murphy's Myrtelhain*. 'Ἀχαρὰν is less satisfactorily translated by *Heringsdorf*. There is surely no reason why a deme in the heart of Attica should have a name which would be appropriate to a fishing village on the coast.

But the editor's main concern is with the author's text. The Heidelberg MS, which is practically our only authority for nearly the whole of the speeches now extant, is notoriously corrupt, and the editor's object has been to remove all textual difficulties by accepting all the best emendations of previous critics and by introducing many of his own which are often well worthy of the attention of future editors. His critical appendix covers ten closely printed pages, and I have examined all the details which it contains, in the case of eight out of the fourteen speeches.

In *Or.* 7, *de olea sacra*, § 29, the MS has (*δεῖναι δέ μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι...τοῦτον...*) *ἀπογράφαι μ' ἐγγύς μορίαν ἀφανίσεν*. The editors omit *ἐγγύς*, on the supposition that it has been wrongly repeated from the previous line. Weidner, perhaps rightly, proposes *ἐκ γῆς*. The same emendation had occurred to myself, and I should feel some confidence in its correctness but for the fact that, where the phrase first occurs in § 2, the article is used: *ἐλαίαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀφανίσεν*. In § 34, the emendation *ἐπομος εἶην* (for *ἡμην*) is anticipated by Dobree, and is actually printed in the Zurich edition. In the same § (*τῶν τοῦτου λόγων καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐμῶν*), *ἔργων* is needlessly changed into *ἐχθρῶν*. In § 39, *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν* is satisfactorily altered into *ἐγνωκέναι μὲν οὖν*, but it should have been stated that *ἐγνωκέναι* had already been proposed, though not in the same position in the sentence. In § 22 (where the MS has *εἰ φῆς μὴ δεῖν*) Weidner proposes *εἰ φῆς μὲν μ' ἰδεῖν τὴν μορίαν ἀφανίζοντα τοὺς <δ>* [for *ἐννεία*] *ἀρχοντας ἐπήγαγε*. Here I should prefer suggesting *εἰ εὐθύς μ' ἰδὼν τὴν μορίαν ἀφανίζοντα τοὺς ἐννεία ἀρχοντας ἐπήγαγε*. In § 24 the MS has: *ἐπίστασθε γὰρ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ πολλὰς μορίας οὐσας καὶ πυρκαϊὰς ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς μῶσι χωρίοις*. Here *πυρκαϊάς* is open to grave suspicion. It is almost incredible that Harpocration, while he explains such words as *σηκός* and *ἐπιγνώμων* in the present speech, should offer no remark on so exceptional a use of the word *πυρκαϊά*. It is now generally understood to mean (as in Liddell and Scott): 'an olive tree which has been burnt down to the stump and grown up again a wild olive,' but this instance of its use, if it be an instance, is absolutely unique. Rather than accept this departure from the regular meaning of

the word, I would suggest *ποκνάς*. Such a word comes naturally after *πολλάς* and it is applied to trees in Xenophon's *Anab.* iv 8 § 2, and elsewhere.

Or. 16, *pro Mantiheo*, § 7. *ἐμὲ τοῖνυν οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀποδείξειεν οὐτ' ἀπενεχθέντα ἐπὶ τῶν φυλάρχων οὐτε παραδοθέντα τοῖς συνδίοις οὐτε κατὰστασιν παραβάντα*. Weidner prints the last word *καταβαλόντα*, ascribing the alteration to Bake; but it might have been stated that that critic himself withdrew his suggestion in favour of *λαβόντα* (*scholien hypomnemata*, v 163). In § 15, we have the well-known description of Thrasybulus, *τοῦ σεμνοῦ Στειρείως τοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις δειλίου ἀνειδικότος*. The MS has *τοῖς πασιν*, whereupon Weidner prints *τοῦ τὸ τ ε...ἀνειδικότος*, but surely, after *τότε*, we should in this passage naturally expect, not the perfect, but the aorist. The text is therefore better left as it stands.

Or. 19, *de Aristophanis bonis*. In § 23 we have a good emendation: *μηδενὸς ἀπορήσειν ἐκεῖ, προσγρημένον* for *μηδενὸς ἀπορήσειν ἐκ Κύπρου, ἡρημένον*. In § 62, the MS has: *οὐ μόνον ἵππους ἐκῆσαστο λαμπροὺς ἀλλὰ <καὶ Cobet> ἀθλητὰς ἐνίκησεν Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ Νεμέας*. Reiske (followed by Scheibe) inserts *οἷς* after *ἀθλητὰς*, while Taylor and Bake (followed by Westermann, Rauchenstein and Froberger) simply alter *ἀθλητὰς* into *ἀθληταῖς*. Weidner needlessly changes this into *ἀθλοδόχοις*, which occurs in the *Iliad* (ix 124) as an epithet of a racehorse, but is apparently never found in prose. On the other hand, *ἵππος...ἀθλητῆς* is supported by Plato, *Parmenides* 137 A, which is sufficient to defend the text as hitherto printed, and to prove (in addition to general considerations) that the word must not be rendered 'athlete,' but 'race-horse.'

In Or. 23, *contra Panceleonem*, § 3, the MS has *τοὺς Ἑρμασιῶν Δεκελῆς προσφοιτῶσιν*. Weidner accordingly prefers *τοὺς Ἑρμᾶς οἱ* to the usual text, *Ἴνα οἱ*. My examination of the critical notes to four other speeches (Or. 22, 24, 30, 32) does not suggest any special remarks.

The book closes with an extract from Xenophon's *Hellenica*, ii chaps. 2-4, giving his account of the tyranny of the Thirty and the restoration of the Democracy, which may be conveniently read together with the speech of Lysias against Eratosthenes. Here again we have several interesting emendations. Thus in II 4 § 36, where the MSS have *ἀμφοτέροις τῇς [μετὰ] Πεισανδρῶν γνώμης ὄντες μάλλον ἢ [τῆς] μετὰ Ἀνandρῶν*, Weidner improves the text by discarding the words placed in brackets.

J. E. SANDYS.

Index Thucydideus. *Ex Bekkeri Editione stereotypa confectus* a M. H. N. von ESSEN Dr. Hamburgensi Berolini apud Weidmannos, 1887. (12 Mk.)

This index will be of essential service to the student of Thucydides. It is not a lexicon, giving explanations or context, but an index pure and simple, and as an index it seems perfect. I have tested it carefully in several places, and not found the slightest error or omission.

As an example of its completeness, the several cases of *δ* take up thirty-one large octavo pages with double columns; *τε* takes seven columns.

Changes of accent or breathing are not passed over; thus *ἀπό, ἀπὸ, ἀπ', ἀφ'*, are arranged under separate headings, and the same principle is followed throughout. The whole number of pages is 457. The gratitude of all classical men is due to Dr. von Essen for his work of labour and love.

C. E. G.

Aristotelis quae feruntur Oeconomica. Recensuit FRANCISCUS SUSEMIHL. (Teubner.) 1 Mk. 50.

THIS volume is a companion to Susemihl's *Nicomachean Ethics*, his *Politics*, and various other Teubner texts of Aristotle, the character of which is well enough known to need no description here. In his introduction Susemihl gives his assent to the view that no part of the *Oeconomica* is the genuine work of Aristotle himself. He holds the first book on the one hand to be mainly made up out of the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon and the *Politics* of Aristotle, and on the other to take up some position inconsistent with those of Aristotle himself in the *Politics*. With some hesitation and apparent leaning towards Eudemus as the author, he is yet not prepared to reject the statement (which is at least as old as the time of Philodemus) that this first book should be ascribed to Theophrastus. As to the list of notable devices for raising money, which constituted the second book, there is of course no question now as to its non-Aristotelian origin. Susemihl has collected in a long note what he thinks the reason for regarding it as 'labentis graecitatis memorabile documentum'. A third book existed for us only in two Latin translations, which are here placed face to face. The Greek text of the two first books is printed with Susemihl's usual care and judgment and supplemented as usual with a full statement of various readings and conjectures. Good separate indices for the two books are added. In an appendix the editor has collected for the benefit of Aristotelian scholars a supplementary list of conjectures on all the Aristotelian treatises as yet published in the Teubner series. They are especially copious on the *De Anima*, the *Metaphysics* and the *Rhetoric*.

H. R.

St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: with a critical and grammatical Commentary, by CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Longmans. 1887. Pp. xxiv. 344. 16s.

MOST English students of the Greek Testament have worked with one or more of Bishop Ellicott's earlier *Commentaries* on Epistles of S. Paul. The present *Commentary*, which follows the latest of its predecessors after an interval of a good many years, is very similar to the others in form, the only change of much moment being the omission of a continuous translation. 'The reason why it has been omitted is the very simple one that a far better translation than any one that I could produce is now in the hands of the Christian reader . . . the revised version of the N. T. . . . Of the version itself, to which I thus gladly give place, I do not, from the nature of my connexion with it, feel it either necessary or desirable to say more than this:—First, that I have gone over it in this Epistle in the closest manner, as a fair and unbiassed critic, and as one who has allowed no predilections or reminiscences of the past in any degree to influence his present judgment. Secondly, that the sum and substance of this review of it has led me conscientiously to regard it as the most accurate version of this Epistle that has ever yet appeared in any language.'

The Greek text is the result of independent consideration of the material supplied by Tischendorf and Tregelles, and approximates closely to that of Westcott and Hort, from whose decisions Dr. Ellicott only occasionally dissents (e.g. i. 1, 14; ii. 1; v. 2, 5; vii. 9, 15, 17), and in some of these cases with much hesitation. The labours of Westcott and Hort 'must be admitted by every fair-judging scholar to have at length placed N. T. criticism on a rational

basis, and to have demonstrated to us with singular force and cogency the true critical value of the numerous witnesses.'

The *Commentary* is rightly described on the title-page as 'grammatical.' The details of S. Paul's constructions are worked out with great care, and sometimes with great minuteness; and in such matters (as readers of his earlier *Commentaries* are aware) Bishop Ellicott can put a very fine point on a question of grammar. The present work will in this particular be of great service to the student who wishes to advance in Greek scholarship *pari passu* with knowledge of the N. T.

Another marked feature of the volume is the care bestowed upon the ancient Versions and the Greek expositors of the Epistle, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Eusebius, and others. 'They really form the backbone of this *Commentary*.'

With a conciseness, which almost rivals that of Professor T. S. Evans, the Bishop dismisses in less than ten pages the subjects usually treated of in the Introduction. In spite of recent assaults made by one or two critics of the extreme Dutch school, he does not condescend to discuss the genuineness of the Epistle. He merely gives nine or ten references to the passages in which the earliest mention of it occurs, and leaves them and the Epistle itself to settle the question. Nor can this method be much blamed. The critic who questions the genuineness of 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians, succeeds in proving nothing so clearly as his own want of critical insight.

It remains to give some specimens of the details of the *Commentary*. In the following instances the results arrived at will meet with the approval of many who have studied the questions for themselves. 1. The number of the factions is determined as four. The parties of Paul, Apollos, and Peter called out a fourth party, which in disavowing all human leaders became probably the most intolerant of all, while it assumed as a party cry the sacred name of Christ (pp. xix. 17). 2. There is reference (v. 9) to a lost Epistle prior to the two which have come down to us (pp. xix. 90). 3. 'Use it rather' (vii. 21) refers to the slavery rather than the emancipation (p. 125). 4. The 'spiritual rock accompanying them' (x. 4) is a figure suggested by the knowledge that the not yet incarnate Word was present with the Church in the wilderness, and not by the 'grotesque Rabbinical tradition' that a mysterious fountain followed the Israelites during their wanderings (p. 176). 5. 'Because of the angels' (xi. 10) is taken literally. There must be decency at public worship out of respect to the unseen beings who are then present (pp. xxiii. 205). 6. Two distinct forms of the gift of tongues are recognized: the power of speaking in languages known to the hearers, but unknown to the speakers (Acts ii. 4; Mark xvi. 17), and ecstatic utterances of prayer and praise in sounds not generally intelligible (1 Cor. xiv.). 7. The common interpretation of being 'baptized for the dead' (xv. 29)—that it refers to baptism of living proxies for those who had died unbaptized—is maintained (p. 309), but with diffidence. An explanation that can command general assent has yet to be found.

One note deserves to be quoted almost in full, viz. that on *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν* (xi. 24). 'Do this (present; i.e., continually thus take bread, give thanks, and break it) *in remembrance of me*; the possessive pronoun being here taken objectively, 'in memoriam mei,' but without any implied emphasis (Edwards): comp. xv. 31, Rom. xi. 31, xv. 14, and Winer *Gr.* § 22.7. If any special emphasis had been designed, the personal pronoun would obviously have

been repeated in its full form, and placed at the end of the clause. . . . To render the words 'sacrifice this,' in accordance with a Hebraistic use of *ποιεῖν* in this sense in the LXX. (Exod. xxix. 39, Lev. ix. 7, *al*; see Schleusn. *Lex. Vet. Test.* s.v.) is to violate the regular usage of *ποιεῖν* in the N. T., and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them' (p. 216). In short, to quote this text in support of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is only in degree less unwise than to quote the passage about the Three Heavenly Witnesses in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. Supposing that S. Paul and S. Luke did *not* mean to suggest any sacrificial meaning, what word would they have been more likely to use than *ποιεῖν*?

The *Commentary* will be very helpful to many students of the N. T.

A. PLUMMER.

La Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini. PAR PIERRE DE NOLHAC. Pp. xvii + 483. Paris. 1887.

THE library formed by Fulvio Orsini (a name unnoted by Hallam) ranks as the finest collection of the sixteenth century. A member of the illustrious Roman family whose name he bore, his desertion by his father at an early age would probably have effectually precluded the lad's attention to letters, had he not happened to attract the notice of Delfini, a learned and excellent canon of Rome. Delfini's good offices introduced him in turn to the brother cardinals, the two Farnese. Eventually, Orsini became a member of the household of Alessandro Farnese, and under his guidance the costly collections of books and antiquities which adorned the cardinal's country seat at Caprarola and the Palazzo Farnese in Rome were to a great extent formed. Under the roof of his august patron, Orsini became acquainted with many of the foremost leaders in art and in learning, and notably with Michel Angelo and with Cardinal Granvelle. It was the latter eminent patron of learning who defrayed the expense of printing, at Plantin's press at Antwerp, Orsini's first publication—his *Virgilius illustratus*, a work devoted to the illustration of Virgil by passages gleaned from other writers of classical antiquity. Although Orsini was himself a dignitary of the Church and a representative of that more sober spirit which characterised learning in Rome subsequently to the Tridentine era, it is singular to note that not a single patristic writer appears in the long array of his splendid collection. Whenever it so chanced that a copy of a Greek or Latin Father came into his possession, he hastened to present it to one of his friends. The most valuable portion of the library which he brought together by his life-long labours was that represented by the collections which had formerly belonged to Cardinal Bembo, who died in 1547. And the entire collection, which before Orsini's death in 1600 was held to be superior even to that enshrined in the Vatican, when added to the latter by his bequest, formed in turn the most valuable part of the Vatican Library itself, and may be looked upon as inaugurating those successive important accessions in the seventeenth century which went so far towards making the Vatican Library what it now is. In this most interesting volume, M. de Nolhac, after a series of chapters devoted to an account of the life of Orsini and of the process by which he accumulated his treasures, gives us the original catalogues of both the Greek and the Latin manuscripts and books, a real boon to the scholar now that the volumes themselves are rendered comparatively accessible by the removal of the former restrictions. J. BASS MULINGER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON MR. WALKER'S 'PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.'

SIR,—Mr. Walker's suggestions are very ingenious, but I am afraid that some of them are scarcely tenable.

(1) He supposes that *φέρω* is **φέρω*, and **φέρω* is an Indo-European *bhero-i-n*, with 'secondary' personal termination. It is quite true that 'secondary' terminations could be used almost anywhere, but I do not think that even Dr. Wackernagel has proved that they could be used in the present indicative. But supposing that they could, the 1st person in *-ō* is firmly fixed as Indo-European by the converging testimony of the Teutonic languages (*nima*, pointing back to a long final vowel in I.-E.), Lithuanian (*cešū*), and isolated forms even in Bactrian and Sanskrit (Curtius, *Verbum* 1. 42, who gives the evidence though he does not accept the conclusion, and Brugmann in Iwan-Müller's *Handbuch* II. 72). Mr. Walker might answer that the I.-E. *-ō* is *-ōm* with the *m* dropped, just as undoubtedly the I.-E. nominative of the word 'ox' was *uksō*, *uksōn*, and *uksōns* according to circumstances. Very well, but why does he go out of the way to find a different origin for *φέρω*? And how does he account for the long vowel in his supposed *-ōm*? But further, if we allow him the I.-E. *bhero-i-n*, it is quite true that it would become **φέρω*; but then it would have had to remain **φέρω* into historical times. Can Mr. Walker produce any case where an intervocalic semi-vowel has vanished without leaving a hiatus visible somewhere in our extant Greek? For I hope he does not continue to believe that *ἐφίλησα* is **ἐφίλε-με-σα* (Meyer, *Griech. Gramm.*, 1st ed. p. 59). As to *δεῖδω*, the hiatus-form is represented by *δεῖδω*, which is obviously **δεῖδω*; and moreover there is no necessity for *δεῖδω* to conceal a perfect at all. It may be a present, *δεῖω* for *δεοῖω*, like *τεῖω* (better spelling) for *γειω*, and the scribes may have put in the second *δ* on the analogy of *δεῖδω* and *δεῖδμεν* when those forms were well established. Altogether, therefore, there seems no reason for disturbing the prevalent view that *φέρω* is an almost unaltered Indo-European word.

(2) Mr. Walker's third person plural in *-σι* is much

more attractive, because it accounts for a real difficulty, the apparent intrusion of the 'primary' *-nti* into a series of 'secondary' persons. I hope it may be right, and I would suggest another bridge from *-σι* to *-āsi* besides Mr. Walker's. The 3rd plural of *γέγονα*, according to Mr. Walker, would be **γέγα-σι*, whereas the plural of **πεφωνα* (as the word must have been) would be **πέφαν-σι* (the *a* and the *v* being both irreducible parts of the root). There is at once a series, **ισσι*, **γέγασσι*, **πέφασσι*, and room for any quantity of analogy. Only we are forgetting the vanishing of *σ*. Are we to say, as we say for *-ισσι* and *-ήσσι*, that in the *σ*-less period people dutifully said **γέγασι* and *πέφασσι*, but when intervocalic sibilancy was re-licensed they restored the *σ* on the analogy of **ισσι* and **παρασι*? (When Mr. Walker says **πέφωσι*, he makes the *κ*-perfect too old, or the *-σι* termination come down too late.) As to *videre*, has Mr. Walker considered the claims of the Sanskrit 3rd plural middle in *tasthīre*, etc.? (Fick in *Göt. Gel.*, *Anz.* 1883, p. 591.)

(3) I do not quite understand Mr. Walker's remarks about the terminations of the perfect, the aorist, and the imperfect in Sanskrit. He says, 'If we confine our view to the Latin and Greek languages, no one would hesitate to identify the endings of the Greek aorist with those of the perfect. . . . But neither is there anything in Sanskrit which forbids us to identify the two sets of terminations. The truth is that Sanskrit has travelled along another path, and has given all its aorists in the main the terminations of the imperfect.' Does Mr. Walker mean that the Sanskrit aorist once had *-tha* in its 2nd singular, and *-a* in its 3rd person singular? That would be slightly supported by *ἦσθα*, but it would require overwhelming evidence from other sources besides. Or is he only thinking of the 3rd plural, and maintaining that the thematic aorist originally had *-us*, like the unthematic aorists and the perfect? I suspect that the latter is his meaning, but I wish he had stated it more explicitly.

T. C. SNOW.

MR. PAGE ON CRITICAL EDITIONS OF THE CLASSICS.

I THINK some of the readers of the CLASSICAL REVIEW must have been a little startled at Mr. Page's eloquent denunciation of critical editions in the last number. It would be interesting to know whether his condemnation applies to editions of Shakespeare and of the Greek Testament, as well as to Horace and (we must presume) to such books as Munro's *Lucretius* and Ritschl's *Plautus*. To use his own figure, I should have thought that, as 'the weary traveller' would prefer an oasis with a well

cleared out and bricked in, to one in which the spring was wasted in sand and mud, so any reader of a classical author would prefer a pure text to one full of corruption, and smothered with the voluminous notes of the conscientious editor, vainly striving to make sense out of nonsense. To my mind the restorer of a genuine text deserves at least as much gratitude and honour from scholars, as the digger of a well from the inhabitants of the desert.

M. A.

NOTES.

IN the Μουσείον καὶ βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς σχολῆς of Smyrna, 1884-5, p. 9 (περ. πέμπτη), there was published in cursive type a metrical inscription, which is hardly earlier than the Roman period, and stands in need of some restoration. The editor describes it as engraved "ἐπὶ μαρμαῶν...εὐρεθέντος εἰς Νέας Φώκας." He prints it as follows:

Τιμοκράτης ὄνομ' ἔστιν ἐμοὶ φί|λε καὶ παροδείτα
Χαίρε· καὶ εἰ|ς τιν' ἔ|χεις συνπαθὴν χάρισαι
Ἐννεα|καδεκάτῳ ἔτι ἤγαγεν εἰς Αἶδα|ν με
μοῖρα· καὶ ἐν φθιμένοις κα|λὸς ἔτ' εἰμὶ νέκυσ.
Ἡκμασα κ|αὶ ἐν (ζωῶσι με|μῖ|γ)μένος ἀνθ|ρώποισιν.
ᾧ...ἄλλοτ' ἔδ|ει φῶς προλιπ...ΙΑΗΝ.

The editor remarks on line 5: πρὸ τοῦ μένος ἄκρον δριζοντείου κεραίας, ἴσως Γ.

These lines should apparently be restored as follows:

Τιμοκράτης ὄνομ' ἔστιν ἐμοὶ φί|λε καὶ παροδείτα·
χαίρε, καὶ εἰ|ς τιν' ἔ|χεις συνπαθὴν, χάρισαι.
ἐννεα|καδεκάτῳ ἔτ(ε)| ἤγαγεν εἰς Αἶδα|ν με
μοῖρα, καὶ ἐν φθιμένοις κα|λὸς ἔτ' εἰμὶ νέκυσ.
Ἡκμασα κ|αὶ ἐν (ζωῶσι με|μῖ|γ)μένος ἀνθ|ρώποισιν
ὧς θεός· ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἔδ|ει φῶς προλιπ|εῖν, σκ|ιά ἦν·

The following may serve as a Latin version:

Timocrates mihi nomen, amice viator: aveto,
Et miserum, si quid seīs lacrimare, dole.
Me fato ad Manes undevicesimus annus
Duxit; adhuc juvenem tristia regna tenent.
Vivus homo in vivis juvenili flore vigebam,
Ceu deus; at quoties nomen vocat, umbra sumus.
E. L. HICKS.

* *

ON A CRUX IN PINDAR'S SEVENTH NEMEAN.—The transitions of Pindar are very sudden but it would be a mistake to believe that they are ever absolutely abrupt; it would be an imputation on his common sense as much as on his poetical sense and skill to imagine that he leaves one topic to go off upon another which is quite disconnected, without notice and without explanation. Such transitions as he makes are softened either by direct intimation of reference to what has gone before; or else by sufficient, however oblique, intimation that a topic is suspended for a parenthetical observation, which has to be taken to heart in order to give enhanced interest and pertinence to the topic when it is recurred to and again proceeded with. Otherwise where such notices are absent, the case is simply that the poet has reason to rely on his hearers being aware of the series of topics which the occasion of his ode makes it natural and necessary for him to touch on; he goes on therefore without preface from one to the other as each in turn is duly attended to, and by such a transition is only satisfying an expectation, not creating a surprise.

In the Seventh Nemean there is no difficulty in tracing the connection of ideas through the first strophe and antistrophe; but to the modern reader, between what seems to be not uniform but universal mistranslation of a phrase, and the not being aware of the drift of allusion which was obvious to the poet's contemporaries, the epode may well have seemed to fly off at a tangent—to not only drop the thread of previous interest, but even to commit the poet to sudden contradiction of all he had been saying just before. To take the version of Mr. Myers, we read, 'in but one way have we the knowledge of a mirror for fair

deeds, if by grace of Mnemosyne of the shining fillet they attain unto a recompense of toils by the sound of voice and verse.' Very good:—but how reconcile we this with what follows as to the false reflection of the mirror of Mnemosyne? and what help is given to us over the stile by the intermediate reflections?

'Wise shipmates know that the wind which tarrieth shall come on the third day, nor throw away their goods through greed of more; the rich and the poor fare alike on their way to death.'

'Now I have a suspicion that the fame of Odysseus is become greater than his toils through the sweet lays that Homer sang, for over the feigning of his winged craft,' &c.

'Feigning' is not a word strong enough here, nor is the 'fictions' of Paley and Carey; Pindar says plumply 'lies' (ψεῦδοσι) and in the next line uses the almost as strong word κλέπτει with reference to the unfair treatment of Ajax as compared with Ulysses.

If we go on through the next strophe and antistrophe we find that the poet, while denouncing both the unfair vote in the matter of Achilles' arms and the partiality of Homer's verse afterwards, declares that 'though the wave of death involves all alike, honour accrues (γίγνεται) to those valiant warriors to whose fame, though now dead, the god gives luxuriant growth' (αἰεῖ).

If we now turn back we may understand that the metaphor of the wise shipmates anticipating a fair wind in due time, which is coupled with the same reflection differently expressed as to the universal doom of death, is introductory to the promise that even if honour due from the Muses and Mnemosyne be falsified for a time, there is a divine power which will provide for ultimate compensation.

It is by the tenor of the tale also that we obtain an interpretation of the phrase—οὐδ' ὅπδ κέρδει βλάδεν. 'The wise anticipate their turn in due time and are not damaged by trickery,'—are not deprived of due celebrity at last by even the misrepresentations of a Homer. (Cf. *Pyth.* i. 92, εὐτραπέλοισι κέρδεσσι, and Boeckh thereon.)

In the Second Pythian, Pindar, denouncing calumnies, craftiness of flatterers and intriguers, compares his detractors to foxes, and playing on the word κερδῶ as name of a fox, subjoins—

κερδοὶ δὲ τί μάλα τοῦτο κερδαλέον τελέθει;

with manifest reference to trickery and not to profit.

I will not trouble you with any further exposition of the sequence and drift of the topics of this ode. To understand it rightly it must be collated with the Eighth Nemean, where the same theme of the unfair rivalry of Ulysses with Ajax is introduced. As long ago as 1862 I published (Williams and Norgate) an elucidation of this ode, in which it is pointed out that the poet directs a gird at Themistocles, the enemy of Aegina, as a Ulysses. This I believed, as I still believe, I perfectly established in the brochure, *Pindar and Themistocles, Aegina and Athens*, which, so far as I have heard, never had a single reader. I was not at the time aware of my identification being open to confirmation by the fact, which I only dropped on lately in one of Plutarch's *Moralia*, that 'Ulysses' was a contemporary nickname of the shifty Athenian. I may note that the prognostication of wind on the third day is noticed by Heyne as agreeing with Pliny's and Strabo's account of the weather signs of the Lipara islands.

W. WATKISS LLOYD.

CICERO, *ad Quintum fratrem* i. 2. 13 (Tyrrell's second edition, vol. 1, p. 332), alludes to a Greek proverb ὀρθὰν τὰν ναῦν. Prof. Tyrrell in his note gives the entire expression from Victorius, adding however that he cannot discover where Victorius got it. I find it in Aelius Aristides, *Oratio Rhodiaca*. Opp. ed. Jebb, vol. i. p. 543, Canter ii. p. 346. The passage reads as follows: Καίρὸς δὲ νῦν...σῆναι δὲ πρὸς τὴν τύχην λαμπρῶς, ἐνθυμηθέντας ὑμῶν τὸν τοῦ πολέμου κυβερνήτου λόγον, ὃς ἔφη χειμαζομένους αὐτῷ τῆς νεῆς, καὶ καταδύσεσθαι προσδοκῶν, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ θρυλούμενον· ἄλλα, ὦ Ποτείδαν, ἴσθι ὅτι ὀρθὰν τὰν ναῦν καταδύσω...ὥς τοῦ μὲν ἀπολέσθαι καὶ καταδύναι τὴν ναῦν τὴν τύχην κυρίαν οὖσαν εἶ, τοῦ δὲ ἄ χρῆ πρᾶξαι πρὸς τοῦτου, οὐκ ἐπὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ τὴν ἀπαίτησιν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν αὐτῷ τινα τοῦτο ὀφείλοντα, καὶ οὗ μόνον κύριός ἐστιν, οὐχὶ δέον προλιπεῖν ἐπὶ ζῶντα.

T. K. ABBOTT.

A PARALLEL BETWEEN THE SIEGE OF PLATAEA AND THAT OF ST. DAMIAN.

In reading the *Commentaries* of Blaise de Montluc (called by Henry IV. '*le Bible des Soldats*') I have come across the following parallels to some of the events in Thucydides' account of the attempt on Plataea by the Thebans and of the subsequent siege.

Thus when the Thebans had effected their entrance, the townsmen waited till the night was just ending in the dawn before they sallied out from the houses in which they had established themselves.¹ So Montluc, speaking of the surprise of St. Damian in Piedmont by the French in 1551, tells us that it was taken 'entre la pointe de jour et le soleil levant,'² and exhorts captains always to have sentries properly posted on the walls 'mesment sur la pointe du jour, car c'est lors que les executions se font; on est las de veiller et non pas l'ennemy de vous guetter.'³ Montluc gives a reason not unlikely to have operated on the minds of the Plataeans as well as the local reason given by Thucydides.

Again, the incident of the besieged Plataeans withdrawing into the town through an opening in the wall, the earth of the besiegers' mound,⁴ meets its parallel in the siege of St. Damian by the Imperialists in 1553. They had battered and effected a breach in the town wall, and Montluc goes on to say⁵ :—"Or les deux jours derniers ils firent une grande batterie, et avoit

fait faire le sieur dom Ferrand grand quantité de fascines que les soldats espagnols, italiens et allemans jettoient dedans.....mais autant qu'ils en jetoient, le capitaine Charry, qui estoit dedans, les retiroit dans la ville par un trou qu'ils avoient au dessous de la bresche; de sorte que, pensant que ledit fossé fut remply, ils l'envoyèrent recognoistre en plain jour, estant en bataille pour donner l'assaut; mais ils trouverent qu'ils n'y avoit rien," &c. The siege was raised two or three days after.

The last parallel is no less exact. It will be remembered with what effect the escaping Plataeans while passing their last obstacle, the further ditch, poured in their missiles on the guard coming up with torches.⁶

The like befel at the siege of Sienna, where Montluc commanded in the city. Early in the morning of Christmas Day 1554, the Imperialists attempted an escalade, and succeeded in taking an outwork. Their commander the Marquis of Marignan, on hearing of this success, brought up the rest of his army in support, but owing to the nature of the ground was not able to get up till the besieged had time to retake the work. 'Et nous,' goes on Montluc,⁷ 'qui pensions avoir tout achevé, vismes venir tout leur camp, ayant plus de cent cinquante torches;' and he was able to keep up so well directed a fire of arquebuses on the illuminated ranks of the enemy that they retired at daylight. The latter, Montluc says,⁸ 'firent la plus grande folie que gens pouvoient faire, car à la lumiere des torches nous les voyions plus clair que s'il eust esté jour: s'il fussent venus à la faveur de la nuict avec peu de lumieres ils nous eussent donné plus d'affaires.' And further on,⁹ with reference to the losses of the enemy he remarks: 'et ce qui leur en fit tant perdre à eux fut la lumiere des torches qui faisoit que les notes ne pouvoient failir.'

The besieged, when reduced to the last extremity, obtained honourable terms, and the troops, accompanied by all the inhabitants who wished to leave, marched out with all the honours of war. The two commanders met and discoursed pleasantly, Montluc taking an opportunity of saying to the Marquis,¹⁰ 'qu'il avoit fait une grande faute d'estre venu à moy, comme firent les Juifs pour prendre nostre Seigneur, car ils avoient apporté lanternes et flambeaux qui me donnoit grand avantage. Il me respondit, baissant la teste, car il estoit fort courtois: "*Signor, un'altra volta sarò più savio*" (Monsieur, je serai plus sage une autre fois).'

V. T. THOMPSON.

¹ Thuc. II. c. 3, s. 4.
² *Comm. de Montluc* vol. 2, p. 79; vol. 21 of Petitot's *Collection of Mémoires sur l'Histoire de France*.

³ Montluc *supra* p. 81.

⁴ Thuc. II. c. 75, s. 6.

⁵ Montluc *supra* p. 132.

Thuc. III. 23. ⁷ Montluc *supra* p. 223. ⁸ *Ib.* p. 224.
⁹ *Ib.* p. 223. ¹⁰ *Ib.* p. 296.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE SO-CALLED ASIATIC TERRA-COTTA GROUPS.

THE subject of M. Reinach's paper is the summary of a very pretty quarrel, of which some rumour at least has probably reached most of our readers. M. Reinach has done great service in the present article by his succinct history of the campaign, which is gradually reducing itself to an issue between archaeologists and amateurs. The second half will appear in next month's issue.—C.S.

If an archaeologist ever attempts to retrace the history of antiquarian forgery, one of the most interest-

ing and attractive chapters of his book will be devoted to terra-cottas, especially to those much admired and, in our opinion, much over-rated groups which have been known since 1880 as Cymæan, Myrinaean, Ephesian, Asiatic *in genere*, &c. I have already written a good deal on this subject, but the day is yet far when it can be treated in a definitive form, as M. Clermont-Ganneau has done in the case of the antiquarian forgeries in Palestine. The reason is that many important points remain yet obscure and unsettled; we know very little concerning the origin and the

authorship of the forged groups, and that very little can not be put down in print until it is proved beyond discussion. For motives easy to understand, the mention of proper names of dealers—*percant nomina!*—must, as much as possible, be avoided. However, in a matter of that kind, disdainful or over-prudent silence might lead to the same result as silent complicity; it is the duty of those who are convinced of the existence of forgeries to warn the public and the museums against them. That duty I have never sought to escape, and I have recently had the pleasure of converting some scholars to my opinion—a compensation for the abuse which I have occasionally met with from others. Still, a great many amateurs and artists, and also a certain number of professional archaeologists, uphold the antiquity and the excellence of the groups in question. The majority of them are unacquainted with the *literature* of the matter, which has become rather considerable and is not of easy access. The purpose of the present paper is to give an historical review of the controversy from the beginning, with the indication of the *published* groups which are the elements of any objective judgement, and of the pamphlets or minor articles which refer to them. The motives for suspecting the *Asiatic* groups will be stated in the review of the literature. Although the groups are the most important elements of the problem, I shall be obliged to mention now and then other counterfeits which stand in close relation to them; but I will not enter here into close discussion on the authenticity of the isolated statuettes which seem equally subject to much doubt.

The *vogue* of Greek terra-cottas began in Paris about 1873, when the Tanagraean figures made their triumphant appearance in the market. The first terra-cottas from Myrina were discovered about 1874, and studied at Ali-Aga by M. G. Hirschfeld (*Nécropole de Myrina*, p. 3); among them were two remarkable groups, one of which, now belonging to M. Waddington, has been published by M. Froehner (*Terres-cuites d'Asie-Mineure*, pl. 24). Up to that date, the only Asiatic terra-cottas known to scholars were: 1. The fragments discovered in Tarsos (Ainsworth & Barker, *Lares and Penates*, London, 1853; Heuzey, *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, Nov. 1876; Froehner, *Terres-cuites d'Asie*, pl. 15; *Musées de France*, pl. 30-34); 2. Some statuettes from the environs of Smyrna, mentioned, but not published, by Welcker (*Alle Denkm.*, 1864, v. p. 483); 3. Fragments from Smyrna belonging to M. Piot in Paris (Lenormant, *Catal. de la Collection de M. Eugène P.*, Paris, 1870, Nos. 220-231). About 1877, gilt terra-cottas, said to have been discovered at Ephesos, reached the museums of Berlin and the Parisian collections (cf. *Griechische Terra-cotten aus Tanagra und Ephesos*, Berlin, 1878); some of them were groups, for instance, that of Eros and Psyche (*Revue Archéol.*, 1878, ii., pl. xix.). These gilt terra-cottas were mostly retouched and much completed, but they cannot be looked upon as wholesale forgeries. Many gilt heads and fragments from Smyrna entered the collections at the same time. The real *provenance* was not indicated, and the attribution to Ephesos was a falsehood. Very few terra-cottas indeed have been discovered at Ephesos, and those we know of are of a trivial style (e.g., one Satyr in the British Museum, with a ϕ engraved on the *reverse*, from Mr. Wood's excavation).¹ Discussion on the subject began in 1878, when a number of Asiatic terra-cottas appeared in the *Exposition rétrospective* at the Trocadéro in Paris. M. Bode expressed the opinion that the gilt

terra-cottas were pasticcios (*Beiblatt zur Zeitschrift f. bild. Kunst*, 29 Aug. and 5 Sept., 1878; translated in *Rev. Archéol.*, 1879, i. p. 95). F. Lenormant warned the public against the forgeries of Asiatic terra-cottas (*Rev. Arch.*, 1878, ii., p. 137), quoted some of these as being imitations of Thorwaldsen and Fogelberg, in the style of Canova and his school (*Contemporary Review*, 1878, p. 858 and foll.; *Gazette Archéol.*, 1878, p. 201 and foll.), adding that Rayet denied the *provenance* to be Ephesos (*Gaz. Arch.*, 1878, p. 201). That very same year, the Berlin Museum had received from Athens a number of so-called Ephesian terra-cottas, which were soon proved to be pasticcios and sent back to the dealer. Lenormant (under the name of Liénard)² alluded to the fact (*Gaz. Arch.*, 1879, i. p. 189-192), indicating (but not naming) Longpérier as one of the archaeologists who most strongly suspected the figures from Ephesos. In fact, Longpérier, who had been intrusted with the care of organizing the *Exposition rétrospective*, had rejected as forgeries several terra-cottas which were presented to him, but I have been unable to ascertain whether those figures belonged to the Ephesian class or to the—then almost unknown—fabric of Myrina.

Next to Lenormant, O. Rayet took a part in the debate. In 1878 (*Gazette de Beaux Arts*, Sept. 1878, p. 382, reprinted in *L'art grec au Trocadéro*, 1879, i. p. 92 foll.) he mentioned the fabrics of Smyrna, Magnesia, Pergamon, Miletos, Mylasa, and Tarsos, and protested against the designation of Ephesian terra-cottas; he also discussed, but without coming to a conclusion, the authenticity of a large Pan's head in the Gréau collection (published by Froehner, *Terres-cuites d'Asie Mineure, Collections Gréau*, pl. i., ii.). In the catalogue of his own collection (*Catal. de la collection de M. O. Rayet*, Paris, 1879, p. 30), he briefly stated all that was known at the time concerning Asiatic terra-cottas. He believed the majority of the so-called Smyrnaean and Ephesian terra-cottas to be genuine, but added that he had only seen a small number of them, the principal dealer in statuettes of that class not being his friend (an allusion to a well-known antiquary, with whom Rayet had quarrelled at Athens). That same year (1879), M. Hoffmann, the Parisian dealer, having received terra-cottas from Aeolis, and wishing to settle the debate about their genuineness, wrote to M. Waddington, who was then minister, in order to obtain some information. M. Waddington, as we have stated elsewhere in detail (*Nécrop. de Myrina*, p. 13), appealed to A. Baltazzi (died Oct. 1887), the possessor of the site of Myrina, and received in return some of the specimens which had been discovered in 1874. The best results of this enquiry were the excavations of the French school of Athens at Myrina (1880-1883), together with my investigation in the necropolis of Kyme (1880-1881; cf. *Nécrop. de Myrina*, p. 506); these scientific excavations have been followed by many others of a more doubtful character, but certainly attended with success, so that almost all the museums in Europe now possess authentic terra-cottas from Myrina (cf. *Rev. Archéol.*, 1887, i., p. 100; 1886, ii., p. 8, &c.). The first terra-cottas from our excavations were published in 1881 (*Bull. Corr. Hellén.*, v. pl. 6 and foll.), but no article relating to them appeared before 1883 (*Bull.*, vii., pl. 81). We had good reason for being cautious, knowing that Greek dealers had already sent emissaries to Ali-Aga in order to corrupt our workmen.

Meanwhile, the fabrication of the celebrated groups had begun—no doubt in imitation of some authentic ones which have hitherto remained unknown. As

¹ Mr. Ramsay's statement on the non-existence of Ephesian terra-cottas (*Classical Review*, 1888, p. 90; note 1), is not to be taken quite literally.

² Liénard. Fivel, Mansell, Papayannakis, Y, are all pseudonyms of Fr. Lenormant.

early as 1880, a couple of them were exposed for sale at Athens, and the dealer asserted confidentially that they originated from Myrina, having been stolen by our workmen. I have motives for believing, from the description given by a friend, that one of the groups in question was the *Woman with the bull*, published by M. Babelon in the *Gazette Archéologique* (1882, p. 145, pl. 16), when it had become the property of Mme. Darthès (collection Basilevsky in Paris). At the time that group was engraved, the two first issues of the *Collection Camille Lecuyer, terres-cuites antiques* (Paris, 1882) had just appeared. The *Woman with the bull* was said to come from Kyme. M. Babelon justly remarked that the style closely resembled that of the groups in the Lecuyer collection. 'On devine la même main, le même artiste, ou au moins la même école, dans les traits de ces visages féminins, dans l'agencement des plis des vêtements.' Nor did M. Babelon overlook the *Attic* character of the composition, which he aptly compared to the *Nike with the bull* from the Athenian balustrade, and to a cognate bassorelievo found in Italy (*Kekulé, Die Reliefs an der Balustrade*, p. 5).

From 1879 to 1881, M. Froehner published his *Terres-cuites d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, Hoffmann, with forty plates.) Pl. 2 is a funeral banquet which reappeared in the Castellani sale (cp. *Bullett. dell' Instit.*, 17 Jan. 1879); it is certainly genuine, although the heads affixed to the small figures do not belong to the original. On pl. 17 and 24 are two genuine groups from Myrina. The group on pl. 30, from the Basilevsky collection, seems also genuine, but the *Pan and Bacchante*, on pl. 39—40 (Basilevsky collection) is, to say the least, very doubtful, and must stand in close relation to the pseudo-Asiatic series we are dealing with.

The Lecuyer collection has been published in six folio issues, chiefly by the care of M. Cartault (Paris, 1882 foll., Rollin and Feuardent). The following groups, reproduced in prototype, must be briefly enumerated here, as they are the main representatives of the so-called *Asiatic* class. The names inscribed in parenthesis indicate the *provenance* assigned to them by the editor.—1^{re} livr. Pl. O. Dionysos et Méthé (Cymé).—3^e livr. Pl. T. Barque de Charon (Cymé).—X². Pan et Bacchante (Myrina.) Resembles the Basilevsky group, *Terres-cuites d'Asie Mineure*, pl. 39.—Y². Satyre et jeuneuse de cithare (Cymé).—4^e livr. Pl. M². Pan et Nymphe (As. Min.).—N². Pan et Bacchante (As. Min.).—O³. Silène et Dionysos enfant (As. Min.).—U³. Eros couché près d'une jeune femme (As. Min.).—Y³. Jeune femme et ephèbe assis sur un rocher (As. Min.).—5^e livr. Pl. J⁴. Achille, Athéné, Agamemnon (As. Min.) A ridiculous forgery, sufficient to throw discredit on the whole series.—K⁴. Priam et Hélène (As. Min.).—M⁴. Enfance d'Eros (As. Min.).—N⁴. Aphrodite et Eros sur un dauphin (As. Min.).—O⁴. Scène de toilette (As. Min.).—Q⁴. Femme surprise au bain par un Satyre (As. Min.) Ridiculous.—R⁴. Scène bacchique après la vendange (As. Min.).—S⁴. Génie ailé enlevant une femme (As. Min.).—X⁴. Centaure enlevant une femme (As. Min.).—A⁵. Satyre et bacchante conduits par Eros (As. Min.).—B⁵. Scène pastorale (As. Min.) Very awkward.—6^e livr. Pl. M⁵. Eros et Pan (As. Min.).—N⁵. La rencontre au tombeau (As. Min.) An evident imitation of the well-known *plaque estampée* which equally belonged to the Lecuyer collection and had been purchased at Athens by Ol. Rayet. An *attic stèle* is figured in the middle.—O⁵. Une partie d'osselets à la fontaine (As. Min.).—P⁵. Triomphe de Dionysos (As. Min.)

We mention separately three groups of a rather different style: 5^e livr. Pl. L⁴. Hermès et Kalypso

(As. Min.); U⁴. Héraklès terrassant le lion; V⁴. Thésée domptant le Taureau crétois (As. Min.) Of course they may originate from the same modern workshop as the others: quite as much can be said about the large masks published in the second issue (D², E², E² bis, F²), which are by no means free from suspicion. The reader will observe that, while the names of Kyme and Myrina appear in the two first issues, they are replaced, in the four last ones, by the vague indication: *Asie Mineure*. At the end of the sixth issue, M. Cartault very justly remarks: 'Les indications recueillies de la provenance ne doivent être acceptées qu'avec réserves.' The authentic statuettes from Myrina, which had become known in the interval, dissuaded the Greek dealers from indicating that origin and the Parisian ones from accepting it. Nevertheless, the dilettanti and the public at large continued to ascribe those pastiches to Kyme, Myrina or Ephesos—indeed, as we shall soon see, archaeologists occasionally did the same.

A part of M. Lecuyer's collection—comprising many genuine and first-class terra-cottas—was sold by auction in Paris (April, 1883). A quarto catalogue was published at the time by M. Froehner, with many illustrations and twenty-nine phototypes. Several groups of the *Asiatic* species are to be found on pl. iii., vi., viii., x. (Charon), xviii., xxi. Pl. vi. (No. 56) and pl. xviii. (No. 166) are said to come from Myrina; the group of Charon (No. 119) is called 'un des chefs d'œuvre de la plastique grecque!' The results of the sale were highly encouraging: the Charon group fetched 8,000 francs and was purchased for Prince Lichtenstein in Vienna.

As early as the end of 1881, I had visited the Lecuyer collection in company with the late Olivier Rayet. We were much puzzled by the Bark of Charon (one of the few groups that M. Lecuyer then possessed), but, as it was yet unedited and shown to us in a private collection, we naturally kept our uneasiness to ourselves. At the epoch of the Lecuyer sale, our suspicion with regard to the groups was already shared by a great many archaeologists. The British Museum and the Louvre equally rejected the specimens which were offered to them for purchase in 1883. The Vienna Museum acquired but one, from a 'bekannter griechischer Kunsthändler' (engraved in the *Arch. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterr.*, vii. pl. iv., with an article by M. Klein, p. 196). It is a careful specimen of the Asiatic class, but it is a forgery, as has since been acknowledged at Vienna. The Berlin Museum was less cautious. At the Lecuyer sale, M. Furtwängler purchased the group of Pan with a Nymph (Froehner, *Catal.*, pl. xviii. and Cartault, *Coll. Lecuyer*, pl. X²) and, from another source, a second group representing the Bark of Charon (*Archäol. Zeit.*, 1884, p. 66.) In 1884, the same museum bought a group representing a female Ganymede carried off by an eagle ('aus der Gegend von Myrina' *Arch. Zeit.*, 1885, p. 156.) The latter group (a curious forgery), has been published by M. Furtwängler in the *Sammlung Saburoff*; it is an imitation of the celebrated engraved mirror which belonged to the same collection. We shall return in a moment to the Bark of Charon.

At the end of 1884, in one of my *Chroniques d'Orient* (*Revue Archéol.*, 1884, ii. p. 93), I ventured to write a few lines on the subject of the groups ascribed to Kyme: 'Nous ne perdrons jamais une occasion de protester contre cette attribution fantaisiste. L'origine de ces groupes nous est entièrement inconnue, bien que nous les croyons asiaticques. Mais nous sommes certains qu'ils ne proviennent pas de Cymé. Ajoutons d'ailleurs que leur authenticité ne peut être raisonnablement mise en doute.' This last phrase was added to avoid the outbreak of a polemic

which I still wished to defer. In the same article (p. 95), I mentioned the Berlin group of Ganymedes, which E. Curtius had presented to the *Archaeologische Gesellschaft* in Berlin, as discovered in Myrina. 'Le nom de Myrina sert aujourd'hui, comme celui d'Ephèse il y a sept ou huit ans, de pavillon à des marchandises d'origine et de valeur très diverses.' In a footnote, I protested against the name of 'terra-cottas from Ephesus,' which was given, on a label in the Louvre, to some heads coming evidently from Smyrna.

My suspicion as to the non-genuineness of the groups had now risen to a subjective certitude. Not only had I never seen in Asia Minor the smallest fragment resembling them, but my friends in Smyrna, to whom I repeatedly wrote about the matter after my return to Paris, unanimously declared that no such terra-cottas existed. I was acquainted with the forgeries which were current in Smyrna, viz. 1. casts of genuine terra-cottas; 2. patchwork from genuine fragments; 3. so-called Smyrna figures, consisting of a genuine gilt head and a more or less patched up body; many *Hercules* of that class exist in collections, see (*Revue Archéol.* 1886, ii. p. 94, 95 and note); 4. Large terra-cottas, single figures and groups, said to originate from Crete, in general quite valueless and only capable of deceiving innocent tourists. I knew that no man in Smyrna, nay, that no Greek artist, was (nor is) capable of modelling a group like that of Charon, which deceived the most clever amateurs in Paris and Berlin. Authentic or not, the groups could not be *Asiatic*.

Early in 1885, M. von Duhn published the Charon of the Berlin Museum (*Arch. Zeit.*, 1885, pl. i.), together with a sketch of the Lichtenstein (formerly Lecuyer) group representing the same scene (p. 10). I seized the occasion to state my opinion in the *New York Nation* (24 September, 1885): the principal passage of my article runs as follows (p. 266):¹

'In 1880 I dug in Cyme for two months, and only found three terracottas of a very common style; the finer fragments I could collect did not bear the slightest resemblance to most of the so-called *Cynæan* terracottas in Continental collections. The latter are generally large groups, which appear to have been stuck together from very numerous fragments. Strangely enough, no fragment is missing, and the heads, especially, are always in a perfect state of preservation. Now, any one who has witnessed diggings in a Greek necropolis, knows that entire terracotta figures are very seldom to be met with, and that the greater part of them seem to have been purposely mutilated when buried in company with the dead. Moreover, the *Cynæan* groups are covered with a kind of yellowish varnish, alternating with large white spots and exceedingly vivid colours on the heads and attributes of the figures. Again, the draperies are quite different from what might reasonably be expected: instead of the bold and simple movements familiar to Greek sculpture, we find a mass of minute folds which recall the wrinkled surface of a troubled sea.

'Now, these *Cynæan* groups are of uncommon beauty and size, some of them numbering five or six figures worked out with the utmost accuracy. For a year or two past they have been simply styled "*Asiatic terracottas*," and the dealers have dropped the name of Cyme, just as they had previously suppressed the suspicious name of Ephesus. It is whispered among dealers and amateurs that the real origin of these figures is kept a secret by some privileged diggers, who naturally wish the Turkish

Government not to interfere with their business. The precious statuette finds their way to Europe in passing through Athens, but no one can tell what route they have followed on their way to Athens from Asia Minor. A German archaeologist, Von Duhn, recently published in the *Archäologische Zeitung* two very beautiful groups of the Cynæo-Ephesian class, representing a young maiden led by Hermes to Charon's boat—a representation not uncommon on white *lecythi* discovered in Attica. Herr von Duhn, justly struck by so close an analogy, ventures to suppose that the so-called Asiatic groups, and particularly the two specimens he describes, originate in Attica and not in Asia Minor; they are styled *Asiatic* by the dealers, on account of the severe laws existing in Greece against secret digging and the export of antiquities. *The German scholar may be right, and even more so than he himself seems to believe. I agree with him in thinking that these celebrated groups come from Athens, but I am by no means certain that they were discovered in tombs.*

'The question remains whether *Asiatic* groups are patchwork or original achievements—whether some parts of them or the whole must be assigned to a recent period of Greek history. This difficult problem cannot be met with a general answer. I have seen groups belonging to either class. But this is only a personal and subjective view of the matter. I sincerely hope that the mysterious necropolis may yet be discovered—somewhere perhaps between Ephesus and Cyme—and that its discovery will oblige me to confess that I am a very poor judge of Greek terracottas.'

M. Furtwängler replied to M. von Duhn in the *Arch. Zeitung* (1885, p. 153), affirming—strangely enough—that the 'vorzügliche Relief' of Charon certainly originated from the 'so ergiebige Gegend von Myrina und Kyme.' He added that the Lichtenstein group, which had formerly been looked upon as Tanagraean, undoubtedly belonged to Myrina. A third group of Charon, said M. Furtwängler, is now in the hands of a dealer, and comes from the same region of Asia Minor. The imitation of Attic sepulchral reliefs and vases, which had struck M. von Duhn, had nothing astonishing for M. Furtwängler, who quoted, as a parallel instance, a 'splendid' group belonging to Baron L. de Hirsch, where several figures are assembled around a tomb. M. Furtwängler has since disavowed his article, but it was necessary to mention it in our historical review of the debate.

In my answer to M. Furtwängler's note (*Revue archéol.*, 1886, I. p. 159), I insisted upon the resemblance of the Charon group with Attic *lecythi* on the one hand, and, on the other, with the marble vase of Myrina published by M. Ravaisson in 1876 (now in Athens). 'Nous nous contenterons de demander à quelle époque de l'art attique ou gréco-romain la draperie d'une femme a été traitée comme l'est celle de la jeune fille du groupe de Berlin... M. de Duhn a raison lorsqu'il refuse de considérer comme asiatique une terre-cuite représentant une scène qu'on ne trouve absolument que dans l'art attique, et cela pendant une période assez restreinte, bien antérieure à l'époque où les nécropoles de l'Asie Mineure se peuplaient de statuettes en terres-cuites... De quel droit attribue-t-on ainsi à Myrina des groupes admirables, je le veux bien, mais qui ne ressemblent en rien aux œuvres authentiques qu'on y a trouvées, des groupes tout à fait attiques d'inspiration, je le veux bien encore, mais très peu attiques, à mon humble avis, et encore moins asiatiques de facture...' I added in a footnote (p. 160): 'La provenance d'Héraclée à Crète ne serait pas non plus à dédaigner, mais il ne s'agit pas

¹ Some passages from my article have been reprinted in *American Journ. of Archaeol.*, 1885, p. 429.

de la Crète du temps d'Épiménide. M. Rossbach, rendant compte de l'exposition des terres-cuites de Myrina au Musée du Louvre (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 9 Janvier, 1886) exprime le plaisant regret que l'École Française n'ait pas découvert en Éolide "de ces groupes qui nous donnent souvent les éclaircissements les plus étonnants sur les ouvrages de l'ancienne plastique monumentale, groupes dont de beaux spécimens, provenant de Myrina (??), sont réunis dans la nouvelle collection C. L..." Mais depuis quand trouve-t-on des Padouanes à Pompéi, du strass à Golconde, ou de la margarine à Isigny?

My allusion to a Cretan origin was caused by a letter from M. Dem. Baltazzi, where my valued friend, who has always shared my opinion as to the groups, mentioned a man from the Piræus who, having committed a murder, fled to Herakleia, and was supposed to be a clever forger of antiquities (see *Rev. arch.* 1886, II. p. 94). English readers must, perhaps, be told that *margarine* is a kind of adulterated butter, and that Isigny is a place in Normandy where the best genuine butter is produced.

SALOMON REINACH,
Assistant-Keeper in the Museum
of Saint Germain, Seine et Oise.

(To be continued.)

CHRYSE.

THE simplest form of the story of Philoctetes is that of the Kypria, according to which he was bitten by a snake while the Greeks were feasting in the island of Tenedos. We hear of Chryse for the first time in the tragedies of Euripides and Sophocles. In Sophocles Chryse is both the name of the goddess and that of the island where her secret grove was situated. The snake is the guardian of her *témenos*. Phil. 1327, *Χρύσης πελασθεὶς φύλακος δὲ τὸν ἀκαλυφτὸν σπήλιν φυλάσσει κρύφιος οἰκουρῶν ὄφις*. According to Euripides, if we may judge of the contents of his prologue from the metrical argument to the Philoctetes of Sophocles, Philoctetes was bitten because he pointed out to the Greeks the buried altar (*βαυὺς ἐπιγεχωσμένος*) of Chryse, here identified with Athena. He alone knew where the altar was, as he had visited it in the company of Herakles.

Χρυσή, the gold island, was a name of Thasos, (Eust. ad Dion. Per. 517). If we assume, what is very probable, that there was an old legend there of a dragon which guarded the buried gold, we can understand how the story of Philoctetes was localised there, and we may regard the form under which it meets us in the drama as specifically Thasian. There is first of all the simple story of the dragon guarding the gold. Then the place of the buried treasure is taken by the altar and image of an ancient goddess, the protectress of the island, the worship of whom is said to have been introduced by Herakles (Herakles in Thasos, Apollod. II. 5, 9), the idea of the buried gold surviving in the *βαυὺς ἐπιγεχωσμένος*. Subsequently the island of Chryse was sought near Lemnos and, as it could not be found, was either said to have been submerged (Paus. 8, 33, 4) or was identified with the small island of *Néas*, (Steph. Byz. s.v.). The similarity of the legends of Chryse and the golden fleece accounts for the form of the story where Jason is the founder of the altar. Polygnotos and his brother Aristophon both painted Philoctetes. The picture of the former in the Pinacotheca represented Diomedes taking the bow away, that of Aristophon probably shewed Philoctetes bitten by the serpent. As the story of Chryse can be traced to no Epic source, Sophocles and Euripides may have derived it from

the Thasian pictures. Three vase-paintings relating to this story have been published, (1) stannos with Philoctetes bitten by the snake in the presence of Diomedes, Agamemnon, Achilles *Mon.* VI. 8. (2) fragments of a crater with the same subject, Millingen, *Peintures*, pl. 50. (3) a crater with the sacrifice of Herakles to Chryse on his way to Troy, *Ar. Zeit.* 1845 pl. 35, 1). Common to all these is the remarkable idol of Chryse which holds its hands upwards and outwards, a gesture said by Roscher, *Lex.* p. 2092, to be typical of a birth-goddess. This image is obviously not a work of fancy, but the copy of an idol which existed somewhere: very probably it is the Thasian goddess and it doubtless appeared on the picture of Aristophon. The three Philoctetes vases differ so much that we cannot unfortunately learn anything from them regarding the style of Polygnotos or his brother. The Philoctetes on (1) appears to bear some resemblance to several of the figures on the great Orvieto Crater (*Mon.* XI, 38, 39), which, it has been conjectured, gives us the best idea of the work of this master, but this resemblance is perhaps more fancied than real. The composition of the Philoctetes vase is weak; the face of the sufferer alone is not drawn in profile, because it was impossible thus to express acute physical pain, while on the Orvieto Crater many figures are drawn *en face* without any such necessity. Of more importance is the appearance of the idol of Chryse in the scene of the rape of the Leucippidae on the Meidias vase. This establishes a relation between the vase and the picture of Polygnotos, which is confirmed by the occurrence on the vase of Polygnotic motives, and names, and perhaps by the juxtaposition of this scene and an Argonautic episode, as in the case of the original.

W. R. PATON.

AMORGOS.—The French School of Archaeology have obtained permission to dig on this island, and have found the steps of some ancient building and a long inscription (*Athenaeum*, March 17). These excavations ought to throw more light on the pre-Mykenean period of art, of which specimens were recently obtained here by Bent and Dümmler. C. S.

ATHENS.—The excavations at the south-east corner of the Parthenon have further resulted in the discovery of two archaic heads, in marble and terracotta, a marble xoanon holding in the right hand a lyre, and a marble relief with the head of a horse, to which the bronze bit still adheres: also the border of a vase with a chariot race in relief. The ancient road from Athens to the Academy has been hit upon during some excavations near the silk factory: it is in good condition, although not paved.

The American school hope for great results from Kephissia, where they have obtained permission to dig (*Athenaeum*, March 3, p. 283). C. S.

ATTIKA.—The *Philologische Wochenschrift* of Feb. 25 reports that one of the members of the American School has been digging on a site supposed by Milchhöfer to mark the deme Ikaria. This conjecture is confirmed by the discovery (Feb. 4) of important remains of the old temple of Dionysos, a marble seat, inscribed stela, and an inscription recording the honours and crown decreed by the Ikarier to their Demarch Nikon. C. S.

CONSTANTINOPLE.—The so-called 'discovery of the sarcophagus of Alexander the Great among those recently brought from Saïda, containing the body of the monarch' (reported in the *Daily News*, March 11, and copied into other English papers), is an

archaeological *canard* such as foreign correspondents not unfrequently perpetrate. Probably it has arisen in this case out of some assertion by Hamdy Bey such as that one of the Saida sarcophagi was sculptured in the time of Alexander. C. S.

CYPRUS.—The *Athenaeum* of March 10 publishes a letter from Mr. E. A. Gardner, dated Paphos, Feb. 18, from which I extract the following. On the site of the temple, various pavements and walls have been discovered, sufficient for at any rate a partial reconstruction of the plan: eleven Greek and two Cypriote inscriptions: besides many others at Paphos and in the villages round. 'Most of these are on bases of the Ptolemaic period, and throw some light on the history of that time. One was on the pedestal of the statue erected by the Paphians to Tiberius in gratitude for his rebuilding their temple. Another is a letter of Antiochus to Ptolemy Alexander concerning certain Seleucians who had done a service to his father. The most interesting, perhaps, is a record of the contributors to the *Ἐκαοχρηστία*. Two statues have been found, one small and rude in style, the other in poor condition and of a late period.' The pottery obtained from the tombs is mostly of the late Cypriote type, but includes one vase of Mykenae style. One stele has been found with rough volutes, another with an ornament in blue and red paint, and a Cypriote inscription. C. S.

ELIS.—In the village of Varvasseria, a marble group has been discovered of a lioness tearing to pieces a ram. 'The work is of the Hellenic period, and the execution excellent.' The Government propose to excavate (*Athenaeum*, March 3). C. S.

KYME.—Three marble statues have been found here (Asia Minor) representing Hera, Aphrodite, and Apollo, also two heads of emperors, one of which seems to be Tiberius. 'All are of Roman period, but of good style, and seem the work of able sculptors.' They are to be placed in the Imperial museum at Constantinople (*Athenaeum*, March 3). C. S.

OEROS.—In the *Mittheilungen*, 1886, p. 329, Dörpfeld mentioned the excavations at the large stoa in front of the temple, and the discovery of a theatre northwards in very good preservation. The stoa has now been cleared: it is 110 metres long, and from its proximity to the theatre served doubtless for the convenience of playgoers. Its front was on one of the long sides, which was faced with about fifty Doric columns: on the other three sides were walls, composed of large slabs in the lower courses, surmounted by smaller slabs, with traces of red and green colour. Round these walls were placed marble seats, some of which are inscribed with the names of the donors. The stoa was divided laterally into three portions, consisting of a central hall (divided lengthways by Ionic columns) and two much smaller wings. These are separated from the central hall by walls of poros, with doorways in the centre.

The chief sculptures found are two representations of Amphiaros: the one is a statue of him leaning on a snake-bound staff, like Asklepios: the other, a relief, shows him standing beside the chair of Hygieia, while at an opening above is a head of Pan playing on a reed. Numerous inscriptions were found relating to the cult, and showing that the games were celebrated every five years (*Phil. Woch.* March 3). C. S.

PERUGIA.—In a tomb here has been found a set of tesserae for a game of counters: 16 of these have on one side a number, on the other a word: 33 of marble in elliptic form, two of which have words: and 816

hemispheres of blue, yellow, and white glass: two glass rings of greenish colour: and about 15 spheres of coloured glass. Of those inscribed, the words on the first twelve imply something opprobrious, such as 'moechus,' 'vappa,' etc.: the 13th is doubtful, 'vix rides': while the higher numbers are all of good intent, such as on 25, 'benignus'; and on 60, which was probably the highest possible, 'felix' (*Phil. Woch.* p. 228). C. S.

ROME.—A large arch has been discovered at the foot of the Aventine, built of massive blocks of tufa: under the arch passed a Roman road, and close by very ancient constructions may be traced on the rock, which are thought to be remains of the wall of Servius Tullius. The arch is supposed to be the ancient Porta Trigemina, and the road would in that case be the Clivus Publicus.

Under the Porta Salera have been found inscriptions and tombs: one inscription gives a fragment of the Roman calendar, with the feasts from the 14th to 21st August (*Athenaeum*, March 10). C. S.

THASOS.—I regret to say that Mr. Bent has been compelled to abandon his project of excavating in Thasos, owing to the impossibility of coming to a reasonable understanding with the Turkish authorities. C. S.

THEBES.—The excavations on the site of the temple of the Kabeiroi were on Jan. 17 suspended for the time being. Among the numerous objects discovered is a kantharos inscribed *Σμικρὸς ἀνέθηκε Καβείρων καὶ παίδι*, and a large seat with a similar dedication. The entire *ἱερόν* lies in a hollow between two hills. Of the temple, which consisted only of a *πρόναος* and *σῆκος*, only the foundations now remain. Traces of three periods can be distinguished: the first reaches back well into the seventh century, the second is attributed to the time of the Persian wars, and the third dates from Macedonian times (*Phil. Woch.* March 10). The following inscription has reached me by the kindness of M. Eustratios Calopais, advocate at Thebes, who discovered it in the course of archaeological researches on the site of the temple of the Kabeiroi: it was after his discovery that the German Institute at Athens commenced excavations there.

Καβιράρχη

Πυρρίδας Ἀθανίης	Νίκαρχος Θιάωνος
Ἀριστογίτων Νικοδόμου	Ἀριστίας Νικίππιος
Θιάτιμος Πολυστράτων	Διονύσιχος Ξενοκρίτων
Καλλιστόνικος Μελάσσω	Θιόκριτος Κουλιῶνος
Παραγωγίης	Φίλων Ἀμνίχιος
Ἐρουξίλαος Διοδώρου	Δαμασίας Πτωιώωνος
Ἰσμενίας Φιλομειλίδαο	Βούκων Φαστίης,
Αὐτόνοος Εὐθυμίου	Νυμεινίος Ἀσποπόδαρου.
Πυρρὸς Μναστιχίδαο	

The inscription is interesting as recording the existence of the *Καβιράρχη*, a new (?) meaning of the word *παραγωγίης*, and several important additions to our lists of Boeotian names. C. S.

Beschreibung der Glyptothek König Ludwigs I. Zu München; von Heinrich Brunn. 5te Auflage. Pp. vi., 292. 8vo. Mk. 2. Ackermann, München, 1887.

This edition is of the same form and appearance as the fourth, but contains eight more pages.

The new monuments described are:—

85, a. (p. 106), a marble votive relief, said to be from Corinth, acquired in 1882.

IX. c. (p. 194), Head of Diana—Italian marble—of second century, A. D.

IX. d. (p. 195), Head of Venus—Greek marble—of about the same date.

301, b. (p. 280), Half-Herme of Bacchus—marble—from Aquileia, presented 1885.

Among the alterations in the descriptions, we find that the Apollo from Tenea is more probably a portrait statue to adorn a grave than one of a deity. Several statues that in the last edition were assigned to Roman, are now referred to Alexandrine times, *i. e.*, 127, 128 (Medusa Rondanini), 134 and x. c.

Most change, however, is to be found in the accounts of the portrait statues: thus—

X. d. (p. 204), formerly Diadumenianus, is now the younger Philippus, and 152, once considered a portrait, is now Aesculapius. The claims of 217, 243, and 272, to the names generally given them are questioned, and those given or suggested for 159, 172, 178, 179, 184, 214, and 264, are rejected. References to Bernoulli's work have been introduced throughout.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

Revue belge de Numismatique, volume for 1887.

A. de Schodt:—The "Sidus Julium" on the coins struck after the death of Caesar.

Revue Numismatique, 3rd ser. vol. vi. 1888. Premier trimestre.

A. Sorlin-Dorigny:—'Gold sepulchral obol of Cyzicus.' A thin gold bracteate with the type of the Capricorn and the inscription $\text{KV}\Sigma\text{IKHN}$, probably of the time of Augustus, or later. Several similar specimens have been found in tombs near Cyzicus, and the writer suggests that they were specially made to serve as Charon's fee and were not current coins. In some of the Cyzicus tombs copper coins (also with the type of the Capricorn) served a similar purpose.

J. Svoronos:—'Inedited Cretan coins.' 1. Copper coins inscribed $\text{AN}\Omega$ are attributed to the little-known town Anopolis. 2. *Dreeros*: no coins have hitherto been assigned to this somewhat important place. Some rude copper pieces with the types head of Pallas and Caduceus and the inscription ΔP are here assigned to it. 3. *Erannos*: silver and copper coins with a monogram read by Mr. Svoronos EPAN are for the first time attributed to this town. Dr. Imhoof-Blumer, however, informs me that he still adheres to the view expressed in his *Monnaies grecques* that the specimens are of Asia Minor, probably Pisidian or Pamphylian.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik (Berlin), vol. xv. part 4, 1887.

Th. Mommsen:—'The fifteen mints of the fifteen "Dioceses" of Diocletian.' Mommsen maintains that each Diocese had a single mint. The apparent exceptions of Gaul and Vienna are discussed. A useful list, drawn up by Mr. Head and Dr. Dressel, of Roman coins struck in Britain is inserted. Mommsen thinks that Britain had only one mint—Londonium, and doubts the attribution of the coins with the mint-mark 'C' &c. to a mint at Camulodunum (Colchester). But no explanation of the mint-mark is offered.

Th. Mommsen:—'Equitius.' On the inscription AEQVITI (AEQVIT or EQVITI) which was shown by Missong (*Num. Zeitschrift*, 1873, p. 102 f.) to be indicated on coins of the Emperor Probus. Missong

suggested that 'Aequiti' was an abbreviation for 'Aequitati.' Mommsen sees in it the name of a mint-official, Equitius or Aequitius.—Max Schmidt:—'NK and $\text{N}\Sigma\text{XC}$ on gold coins of the mint of Nicomedia.'—

Svoronos:—'The Cretan coins with $\text{M}\Omega\Delta\text{AI}\Omega\text{N}$.' Describes a didrachm in the Florence collection: *obv.* head of Zeus, *rev.* $\text{M}\Omega\Delta\text{AI}\Omega\text{N}$, bull's head facing. Svoronos assigns the coin to a Cretan town Modaia (probably near Polyrrhenium), and not to Matalia as Sallet suggested.—U. Wilcken:—'On the currency of the Egyptian drachm.'—U. Wilcken:—'On the titles of Vaballathus.' Review.—Mommsen's article: 'Mithradates Philopator Philadelphus' in the *Zeit. f. num.* xv., by Th. Reinach, who opposes Mommsen's view.

WARWICK WROTH.

Builder.

Feb. 25. A full report of Mr. A. S. Murray's lecture at the Royal Academy on the sculptures recently discovered on the Akropolis.

March 3. Mr. Statham's address to the Hellenic Society on 'Greek Mouldings': the object was to induce the Society to get together materials for a complete illustration of the various forms of Greek mouldings in full-size sections. Dörpfeld's paper on the 'Old Athene Temple of the Akropolis.' Recent discovery at Athens. Sketch of the Roman theatre at Arles.

March 10. Bruun's *Denkmäler. Antike Denkmäler*, vol. ii.

Journal of Hellenic Studies, 1887. Vol. viii. No. 2.

1. Murray: the Pasiades alabastos and the Oidiponos lekythos from Cyprus: two plates. 2. Michaelis: the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles: list of copies and variations of type: he agrees with Treu in considering the Olympia head (here autotyped) the best replica: woodcuts, plate. 3. Hogarth: twenty-seven Greek inscriptions collected at Salonica last April. 4. Hogarth and Ramsay: thirty-eight inscriptions from Badinlar and Ortakeui. 5. Hicks: the Thasian Decree, found by Mr. Bent. 6. Hicks and Bent: forty-three inscriptions from Thasos: and a note on buildings excavated there. 7. Harrison: a Panaitios kylix with the myth of Itys and Aedon: two cuts. 8. Paton: vases from Kalymnos and Karpathos: a study on the early history of Hellenic pottery: two cuts, plate. 10. Ramsay: the Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, part ii., with map.

Reviews: Pottier and Reinach's 'Néropole de Myrina'; Furtwängler and Löschke's 'Mykenische Vasen'; Heydemann's 'Jason in Colchis'; Robert's 'Archäologische Märchen'; Ulrichs' 'Ueber griechische Kunstschriftsteller'; Robinson's 'Descriptive Catalogue of Casts at Boston'; Ronchoud's 'Parthenon'; Collignon's 'Pheidias'; Kirchhoff's 'Studien'; Robert's 'Greek Epigraphy'; Studniczka's 'Altgriechische Tracht'; Helbig's 'Homerische Epos'; Gardner's 'Coins of Peloponnesus'; Haverfield's 'Topographical Model of Syracuse.' Index to volumes i.-viii. C. S.

(The remaining summaries of this month are postponed for want of space.)

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Academy: 23 Feb. Reviews of Mommsen's *Römisches Staatsrecht*, iii. 1, by F. T. Richards, and of Max Müller's 'Biographies of Words,' by H. Bradley: J. Cook Wilson protests against a conjecture of T. van Leeuwen in Soph. 'Aj.' 646.—3 March. Reviews of Morris' 'Odyssey' ii., by E. D. A. Morshead, and of Roberts' 'Introduction to Greek Epigraphy,' by E. L. Hicks; M. Müller and A. L. Mayhew on 'Fors Fortuna'; further contributions by H. Bradley and G. Vigfussen in the two following numbers.—10 March. Review of Newman's 'Politics,' by F. T. Richards; report of paper by Dr. Verrall on Hor. 'Od.' 3. 25 (Camb. Phil. Society).

Expositor. 1887 Dec. B. F. Westcott concludes his series of papers on the use of the R.V. by giving examples of the doctrinal importance of grammatical distinctions which were obscured in the A.V.; Paul and Titus at Jerusalem, by G. G. Findlay; recent Foreign Literature on the N. T. by S. D. F. Salmond.

1888 Jan. Characteristics of Modern Exegesis, by F. W. Farrar; Pastoral Epistles, by F. Godet.

Feb. Christ's use of the Book of Proverbs, by R. F. Horton; recent American Literature on the N. T., by B. B. Warfield.

March. Epistle to the Hebrews (Introductory), by A. B. Bruce.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, ed. Fleckeisen und Masius. 1887.

Heft 5 and 6 (1) G. Curtius, *Kleine Schriften* (C. Angermann), a friendly notice. (2) H. Blümner, *Zu Lukianos*, proposing in *πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα κ. τ. α. sub fin. ἰπποκράτους* for *πιπτοκράμης*. (3) L. Lange *Kleine Schriften* (O. E. Schmidt) a biographical notice by an old pupil. (4) G. Knaack, *Mythographisches*, on Charnabon (Soph. *Fr.* 543 N.) and on Eridanus, as a river of Hades. (5) K. Frick, *Zu Synkellos* 607. 9 and 322, 13, two obvious emendations. (6) A. Ludwig, *Angewandte Widersprüche im Homerischen Hermesymnos*, an answer to criticisms suggested in Otto Seck's 'Quellen der Odyssee' (Berlin, 1887). (7) F. Polle, *Zu Thukydides* suggesting in II. 42, 4, *ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀμύνεσθαι κακοπαθεῖν μάλλον ἡγησάμενοι ἢ ἐνδόντες σφίεσθαι* and in II. 44, 1 *ἐπίστανται τραφέντες τὸς εἰνυχέας*. (8) H. Adams, *Die Quellen des Diodoros im Sechzenten Buche*, an attempt to distinguish the portions for which Diodorus relied on Ephoros (or his son Demophilos), Timaios and Duris, concluding with a discussion of Diodorus's chronology. (9) A. Ludwig, *Zu den Griechischen Orakeln*, a series of seven emendations which can hardly be quoted without transcribing the article (the refl. are to Wolff's *Porphyry* and Hendess' *Oracula Graeca*). (10) C. Bäumer *Zum Platoniker Tauros*, suggesting *ὡς ἐν γινόμενῳ* in Jo. Philoponos *περὶ ἀθ. κοσμ.*, VI. 21. (11) Schoell and Studemund, *Anecdota Graeca Metrica* etc. Vol. I. (P. Egenolff) a long notice praising the 'abundant instruction' and careful editing of the book. (12) W. H. Roscher, *Catena = Calumniator*, comparing Cic. *Muren.* 20, 42 with Ann. Marc. XV. 3, 4 and XIV. 5, 8. (13) G. F. Unger, *Romulusdata*, a discussion of the astrological basis of Varro's chronology and of the eclipse which marked Romulus's disappearance. (14) W. Soltan, *Die Römischen Schaltjahre*, an attempt to ascertain in which years, before

the introduction of the Julian calendar, the intercalary months were inserted. (15) H. Gilbert, *Zu Terentius*, suggesting in *Andr.* 315 *quid? nisi illud impetres*, and in *Adelph.* 125 *qui vere sient*. (16) C. Nauck, *Zu Horatius* supporting in *Carm.* I. 13, 2, Bentley's reading *lactea* and suggesting in *Sat.* II. 5, 59, 60, an emendation *aut erit aut non divinare mihi magnus donavit Apollo*. (17) G. Wartenberg, *Zu den Textquellen des Silius Italicus*, a brief account of an inferior MS. in the Museum of the Propaganda at Rome.

Heft. 7. (1) F. Baek, *Zur Gesch. Griechischer Göttertypen*, an attempt first to identify the figure, no. 25, on the east frieze of the Parthenon with Dionysos, secondly to account for the youthful beardless type both of Hermes and Dionysos on the frieze. (2) and (3) are controversies of no interest, peremptorily closed by the editor. (4) R. Wöhler, *Zu Thukydides* II. 54, showing that the variants *Αυδός* and *Λοιδός* do not rest on the identical pronunciation of these words. (5) F. Olek, *Hat sich das Klima Italiens seit dem Altertum geändert?*, opposing the view of H. Nissen (*Ital. Landeskunde*. I. 396-402) that the mean temperature of Italy has risen since the Christian era. (6) A. Weidner, *Zu Cicero pro Sext.* § 69, suggesting *non mihi absenti non crevisse amicos*. (7) Th. Matthias, *Zu Ciceros Rhetorischen Schriften*, a long series of emendations to *De Inventione* and *De Oratore*. (8) H. Stending, *Zu Ciceros Reden*, suggesting in *pro Sex. Roscio* § 64 *quid post? erat sane suspiciosum audisse neutrum nec sensisse, in de imp. Cn. Pomp.* § 18 *nos publicanis omissis vectigalia posse una victoria recuperare, in pro Muren.* § 11 *ut ne rebus communiter gestis aperte etc.* and in *pro Sestio* § 69 *et cum provinciarum . . . perdidissent, quicumque in senatu etc.* (9) E. Bachrens, *zu Ennius, Lucilius, Juvenalis*, reading in Ennius *Frugm.* 348B *in moerum* (= mari instar) for *in metrum*: citing four new fragments of Lucilius (chiefly from Bücheler's *Juvenal*), and proposing in Juvenal XIII. 168 *Pygmaeus longis currit etc.* (10) W. H. Roscher, *Das Danaebild des Artemon und Plinius* supporting *praedonibus* in Plin. XXXV. 139, and explaining it as 'wreckers,' cf. Xen. *Anab.* VII. 5, 13. (11) O. Keller, *Zu Vergilius Aeneis*, proposing in I. 462 to construe *mortalia rerum*, not *lacrimae rerum*, in II. 553 to parse *lateri* as locative, not as ablative, and similarly *arbori infelici, animi excreciari, esse alicui cordi*. (12) P. Regell, *Auguralia*, suggestions for filling the lacunae in Festus 245b. 12-14M. and 31-34. (13) K. Hachtmann, *Zu Tacitus Agricola*, proposing in 18 § 6 *qui ratem* (for *mare*) *expectabant, ratem* bearing the sense 'raft': and in 30 *nam et uni servitutis expertes*.

Heft 8. (1) A. Breusing, *Die Nautik der alten* (K. Buresch) a notice partly laudatory of the book, partly complaining of a review by Herbst in *Philolog. Wochenschr.* June 26th, 1886. (2) E. Hiller, *Der Kokalos des Aristophanes*, rejecting entirely the statement of Clem. Al. that this play was written by Anaros, the son of Aristophanes. (3) K. Zacher *Zu Aristoph. Wespen*, confirming in 107 *εἰσέρχεται* and in 147 *ἐσπερθεῖς*: explaining in 191 *παράβολος* as 'mad': pointing out refl. in 599 and 712 to the trade of shoe-cleaner and harvester: explaining 604, suggesting *καχθῆς* for *καὶ τὸς* in 682, *κατακναίει* for *ἀποκναίει* in 683, and explaining *δημίζοντων* in 699 as 'those whose cry is always *δῆμος, δῆμος*.' (4) K. Zacher *Zu Arist. Frieden*, explaining *Βουκολήσεται*

in 153 as 'he will go to his food,' proposing *καὶ δία* in 201 and explaining *ὁ κατὰ τοὺς ποδοὺς* in 241 by the gloss in V ἀποτιλόντων. (5) H. Stadtmüller *Zur Anthol. Pal.* several emendations. (6) K. Meissner *Zu Ciceros Laelius*, a long critique of the text. (7) Th. Gomperz *Zu Phaedrus Fabeln*, proposing *mea cum sors sit* in I. 5, 8. (8) Th. Maurer *Zu Vergilius Aeneis*, reading in X. 186 *Ricina o paucis comitate Cuparo*, Ricina being a little town in Liguria. (9) E. Auspach *Zu Cornelius Nepos*, a long series of notes, with additions by W. Böhme. (10) K. Nieberding *Zu Horatius*, proposing (after Madvig and Haindorf) in *Sat.* II. 2, 29 *carne tamen, quam vis, distat nil haec avis illa* and attempting, in 13, to give a contemptuous meaning to *pete cedentem aera disco*.

Heft 9. (1) P. Weizsäcker, *Die Beschreibung des Marktes von Athen und die Enneakronosepisode bei Pausanias* (with a plan) an attempt to prove that the passage Paus. I. 8, 6–14, 4 describes the southern side of the ἀγορά, and the continuity of the route is not broken. (2) W. H. Roscher *Nochmals die Schlangentopferföhrin des Altarfrieses von Pergamon*, some additions to the articles on this subject pub. in 1886. (3) H. Stending *Zu Soph. Oed. Tyr.* suggesting in 360 *ἢ ἐκ πείρας λέγεις*; in 715 *ἐννοί τότε*, in 1478 *καὶ σε τῆς γε σῆς ὁδοῦ* and in 1528 *τελευταλὸν σε δεῖ*. (4) G. Knaack *Zu Gregorius von Nazianz*, pointing out imitations, by this poet, of Nikandros, Nestor of Laranda and Parthenios. (5) E. Schulze *Zu Horatius*, an attempt to reduce *Carm.* III. 30 to strophic form (4 stanzas) by excluding v. 2 (*regaliq.ue situ etc.*) and inserting after *regnabit populum* the words *ortus, at ingeni fama factus in urbe*. (6) H. Stending *Zu Tacitus Dialogus*, proposing in c. 6 to omit *diu*, and to read in c. 25 *eo minus si for si cominus*, and in c. 31 *stoicorum principem* (cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* III. 5). (7) S. Dossou *Étude sur Quinte Curce* (Th. Vogel) a summary of the main contents of the book, with a little *a priori* criticism. (8) K. P. Schulze *Martialis Catullustudien*, a tolerably large collection of small parallel passages.

Heft 10. (1) A. Thumb *Die pronomina μὲν und νῦν*, an attempt to derive these words from the particles *sma* and *nu* in combination with the pronominal accus. *ὑν*, mentioned by Hesychius. The particles *sma* and *nu* were really intended to throw emphasis on the preceding word, but the customary collocation obscured the fact. (2) P. Spengel *Opferspenden*, a few notes on libations. (3) K. Nieberding *Zu Soph. Antig.* proposing in l. 4 *ὄντ' ἀτῆρ' ἄνερ* and in 782 *ἔπος δὲ ἐν τλήμοσι πίπτει*. (4) O. Crusius *Ad Plutarchi de Proc. Alex. libellum*, a further series of notes and emendations. (5) W. H. Roscher *Zu Horatius Carm.* II. 13, 15 proposing *Bosporum* (gen. plur.) *pocnas*, cf. Martial III. 64, 1. (6) H. Liers *Zur Gesch. der Stilarten*, a description of the work entitled *Δημητρίου Φαλῆρεως περί ἐρμηνείας ὁ ἐστὶ περί φράσεων*, followed by evidence that Dem. Phalereus was really the author, not Demetrius Syrus, whom Cicero knew in Athens, nor Demetrius of Alexandria who lived in the 2nd cent. A.D. (7) F. Blass *Zu Demosth. c. Leptinem*, an argument, founded on the words *τοῦ παιδὸς εἵνεκα τοῦ Χαβρίου* in c. 1, to the effect (1) that Ktesippos was a child, (2) that Demosthenes was not entitled to represent him, and therefore (3) that the speech was not delivered by Demosthenes.

Heft 11. (1) E. Lange *Zur Frage über die Glaubwürdigkeit des Thukydides*, a hostile criticism of Müller-Strübing's views. (2) E. A. Junghahn *Zu Thukydides*, a comparison of Thuc. II. 2–5 with *Aeneas Tact.* 2, 3–5. (Demosth.) c. *Naearam*, 1378 sqq. and Diodorus XII. 41 sqq. with intent to show that the later writers borrowed, not from Thuc. him-

self, but from the same source as Thuc. (3) E. Hiller *Zu Theognis* l. 6, supporting the *βαδινῆς* of the cod. Mutinensis. (4) G. F. Unger *Das Sophistengesetz des Demetrios Phalereus*, maintaining that the expulsion of the philosophers from Athens, mentioned in Athen. XIII. 92, p. 610, is to be attributed, not with Droysen and Zeller to Demetrius Poliorketes, but with Clinton to Dem. Phalereus, and is to be dated B.C. 315. (5) F. Hultsch *Zu Polybios*, proposing *ἐπείτατον* for *ἀπείτατον* in III. 20, 8 and *ἐπαύρασθαι* for *ἐναύρασθαι* in XVIII. 11, 7. (6) K. Jacoby *Zu Dion. Halik.* a restoration, by rearrangement, of the corrupt passage in IV. 15. (7) K. E. Georges *Miscellen*, a number of emendations chiefly in rare authors. (8) E. Baehrens *Zur Origo Gentis Romanae*, contending that this work is a late compilation (after A.D. 360) from Verrius Flaccus and earlier authors, uninfluenced by Virgil, and concluding with numerous emendations of the text. (9) P. Regell *Die Inauguration der Iteiri sacris faciundis*, maintaining that these priests were not inaugurated at all. (10) A. Otto *Zur Aepriludo Perdicae*, emendations to this poem (in Baehrens P. L. M. V. p. 112 sqq.) (11) R. Förster *Zu Ausonius* proposing *Jons* for *flos* in epigr. 99.

1888. Heft 1. (1) C. Angermann *Beiträge zur Bedeutung Antiker Namen*, dealing with *Icarus*, *Sagra*, *Athenae*, *Attica*, *Kimolos*, *Æsis*, *Isara*, and place-names in -este. (2) A. Scotland *Zu Homers Ilias*, contending that Δ 79–85 and E 267 are interpolations. (3) M. Krenkel *Biblische Parallelen zu Homeros*, a very large collection. (4) C. Cichorius *De Fastis Consularibus Antiquissimis* (F. Rühl) 'careful and acute.' (5) H. Hitzig *Conjectanea Pausaniaca*, a great number of emendations. (6) K. Tumpel *Tyrrenisches von Kyllene*, an attempt to show that this mountain was a seat of the Tyrsenic worship both of Hermes and Aphrodite. (7) T. Opitz *Zu Sallustius*, emendations with additions by W. Böhme and A. Kunze. (8) R. Menge *Se, Ipsi se bei Caesar*, pointing out Caesar's use of *se ipsi* for *inter se*. (9) A. Waltz *Œuvres d'Horace* (R. Bobrik) a summary of contents. (10) M. Manitius *Ueber eine Trierer Caesar Handschrift*, account of a MS. written about A.D. 1101 and forming part of a larger work entitled *Gesta Trevirorum*. (11) M. Manitius *Zu Ausonius und Sidorius Apollinaris*, parallel passages.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen.

Readers of the *Classical Review* will be chiefly interested in Steig's critical catalogue of the Thucydidean literature of the last two years. They will perhaps be shocked to see that no English name appears in the list.

There is also a notice of a new critical edition by H. J. Müller of Seneca's *Oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores*.

Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique. Tome 6me, fasc. 3.

M. Bréal on the importance of the meaning of words in etymology and grammar, reviving incidentally several venerable and long discarded theories—A. Sanchez Moguel shews that the origin of fut. and conditional in the Romance languages was first given in Lebrija's Spanish Grammar, published in 1492—E. Toubin collects passages to prove that *callis* may signify a pasturage in a wood—V. Henry contributes miscellaneous etymological notes on 2 sing. mid. in Attic, on -ā of nom. sing. in Latin etc.—M. Bréal quotes evidence from Greek inscriptions that the symbol H is used to represent the aspirate followed by E, and discusses in detail the Titulus Furfensis—L.

Duvau contributes notes on Oscan and Umbrian—L. Havet notes on various Latin etymologies—F. de Saussure shews that before a consonant a simple and a double mute dental are treated alike (*pet+tron* and *pet+ron* would alike produce *πέρρον*)—M. Bréal contributes 'Varia.'

Revue de Linguistique, vol. xx. 15 July 1887.

P. Regnaud, *Remarques Morphologiques sur les verbes grecs en -vnu, -vu, -avv*. The roots are weak where the suffixes are strong: where the root has a nasal the vowel is weak, where the nasal is wanting the vowel is strong. The general tendency is towards

weakening or contraction as in *δαυρός* for *δαυ-ρός*. The weakening has independent rules in Sanskrit and Greek.

Vol. xxi. 15 Jan. 1888. P. Regnaud *la théorie des deux k indo-européens*. An attack on Ascoli's theory of the two series of original gutturals, and an attempt to show that Sanskrit *c* and *k* both come from a single original sound. Abel Hovelacque *la grammaire indo-européenne d'après Fr. Müller*, in the 'Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft' (Vienna 1887). Müller does not admit *e* and *o* as primitive vowels, rejects liquid and nasal sonants, and makes roots theoretic conceptions like Semitic roots. He distinguishes velars and palatals.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Bradley (H.) *The Goths, from the earliest times to the end of the Gothic domination in Spain*. 8vo. xx. 370 pp. London. Fisher Unwin. New York. Putnam's. 5s.

Key (Th. Hewitt). *A Latin-English Dictionary printed from the unfinished MS. of T. H. K.* 4to. ix. 674 pp. Cambridge. University Press.

£1 11s. 6d.

Sophocles. *The Plays and Fragments, with critical Notes, Commentary, and translation in English*

prose, by R. C. Jebb. Part III. *The Antigone*. Demy 8vo. lxxv. 286 pp. Cambridge. University Press. 12s. 6d.

Virgil's Aeneid. Book VI. Edited for use of schools by T. E. Page, with Vocabulary. 18mo. pp. 140. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

Xenophon. The Anabasis. Book III. With Map. 16mo. pp. 48—88. Rivington. 6d. With Notes and Vocabulary, 1s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Albrecht (P.) *Philologische Untersuchungen*. Vol. I. part I. 8vo. 61 pp. Hamburg. P. Albrecht. 6 Mk.

Caesar. *Commentarii de bello gallico*. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von H. Walther. Part III. Liber V., VI. 8vo. 87 pp. Schöningh. Paderborn. 80 Pf.

Croiset (A.) *Rapport de la commission des écoles d'Athènes et de Rome sur les travaux de ces deux écoles pendant l'année 1886*. 4to. 16 pp. Paris.

Cucuel (C.) *Règles fondamentales de la syntaxe grecque d'après l'ouvrage d'A. von Bamberg*. 2nd édit. entièrement remaniée sous la direction d'O. Riemann. 16mo. iv. 204 pp. Paris. Klincksieck.

Eichner (E.) *Zur Umgestaltung des lateinischen Unterrichts*. 8vo. 60 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk. 20.

Goez (G.) *Quaestiones miscellae*. 4to. 10 pp. Jena. Neuenhahn. 50 Pf.

Gräber (F.) *Die Wasserleitungen von Pergamon*. Vorläufiger Bericht. Mit 6. Beiträge von C. Schuchardt. 4to. 31 pp. 2 pl. (*Extr.* Abh. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.) G. Reimer. Mk. 2.

Günther (G.) *Quaestiones Ammianae criticae*. 8vo. 62 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 60.

Hauréau (B.) *Notice sur le No. 14952 des manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. 4to. 66 pp. (*Extr.* Notices et extraits, xxxii. 2.) Paris.

Hubo (G.) *Originalwerke in der archäologischen Abteilung d. archäologisch-numismatischen Institutes der Georg Augusts Universität*. Festschrift zur Feier d. 50 jähr. Doctor-jubiläums d. Directors Prof. F. Wieseler. 8vo. vii. 200 pp. Göttingen. Dietrich. Mk. 2.

Kurtz (E.) *Miscellen zu Plutarch's Vitae und Apophthegmata*. 8vo. 40 pp. Leipzig. A. Neumann. Mk. 1.

Livy. Liber I.—V., ed. A. Zingerle. Ed. Major. 12mo. ix. 288 pp. Vienna. Tempsky. 1 Mk. 20.

— Liber I.—V. Ed. Minor. 12mo. 250 pp. Mk. 1.

Ogorek (J.) *Sokrates im Verhältnisse zu seiner Zeit*. 8vo. v. 188 pp. Lemberg. 3 Mk. 60.

Omont (H.) *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Part II. Ancien fonds grec. Droit. Histoire. Sciences. 8vo. Paris. Picard. 10 fcs.

Pfleiderer (Ed.) *Zur Lösung der Platonischen Frage*. 8vo. 116 pp. J. C. B. Mohr. Freiburg i. B.

Rayet (O.) et Collignon (M.) *Histoire de la céramique grecque*. Royal 8vo. 16 coloured plates, 145 cuts. Paris. Librairie Illustrée. 40 fcs.

Saussure (F. de). *Sur un point de la phonétique des consonnes en Indo-Européen*. 8vo. 16 pp. (*Extr.* Mém. de la Soc. de linguistique, VI.) Paris.